DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 284 681 PS 016 764

AUTHOR Grubb, W. Norton
TITLE Young Children Face the States: Issues and Options for Early Childhood Programs.
INSTITUTION Center for Policy Research in Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE May 87
GRANT OERI-6-86-0011
NOTE 82p.
AVAILABLE FROM Communications Department, Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ 08901 ($4.00).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Early Childhood Education; Educational History; Educational Planning; *Educational Policy; Educational Principles; Educational Trends; Financial Support; *Public Education; *Public Policy; School Role

ABSTRACT

The growing demand for preschool education has prompted states to examine the feasibility of, and in some cases to enact legislation regarding, early childhood education programs. An effective policy must reconcile the following three primary issues: (1) the historical rift between the educational and custodial models of early childhood education; (2) conflicts between the elementary school and early childhood education communities over purposes, methods, and control; and (3) the necessary trade-offs between costs of programs and their quality. Legislators are in a unique position at this time to examine these issues in order to formulate early childhood policies and enact legislation for new programs. (PCB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED284681

PS 016764

CPRE
CENTER FOR POLICY
RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Young Children Face The States: Issues and Options for Early Childhood Programs

W. Norton Grubb

May 1987

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
RUTGERS
THE RAND CORPORATION
Wisconsin Center for
EDUCATION
RESEARCH

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CENTER FOR POLICY RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

The Center for Policy Research in Education (CPRE), sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, unites the Eagleton Institute of Politics at Rutgers University, The RAND Corporation, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison in a joint effort to improve the quality of schooling through research on state and local education policy.

CPRE has the following goals:

- To strengthen the connections among policy, practice, and performance in American elementary and secondary education,
- To focus education policy research on the central concerns of schooling--teaching, learning, school organization, and student performance,
- To produce knowledge useful to policymakers and their constituents,
- To broaden the range of options from which education policymakers can choose,
- To foster a dialogue between the consumers and producers of education policy research.

To ensure that the Center's work is useful to policymakers, CPRE's research agenda is organized about three questions fundamental to any assessment of education policy.

1. Will the policy improve the quality of schools and student performance?
2. Can it be implemented within given resource constraints?
3. Will it be supported in its implementation?

CPRE Joint Note Series

Joint Notes are issued by CPRE to facilitate the exchange of ideas among policymakers and researchers who share an interest in education policy. The views expressed in these notes are those of individual authors, and are not necessarily shared by the U.S. Department of Education, The RAND Corporation, Rutgers University, or the University of Wisconsin-Madison. This publication was funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, grant number OERI-6-86-0011.

CPRE

CENTER FOR POLICY
RESEARCH IN EDUCATION

Young Children Face The States: Issues and Options for Early Childhood Programs

W. Norton Grubb

May 1987

THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
RUTGERS

THE RAND CORPORATION

Wisconsin Center for
EDUCATION
RESEARCH

CONTENTS

TABLES iv
SUMMARY v
FOREWORD ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS xi

Section

INTRODUCTION 1

I. THE HISTORICAL PERSISTENCE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION 5
The Seeds of Early Childhood Education..... 5
Legislative and Social Influences:
The Emerging Debate..... 7

II. THE CURRENT MOVEMENT: THE CONFLICTING OBJECTIVES OF EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS..... 13
Potential Influences and Policy Initiatives..... 14
Social Influences..... 18
Resolving the Competing Concerns..... 20

III. PHILOSOPHY AND TURF: THE SPLIT BETWEEEN EARLY CHILDHOOD AND ELEMENTARY EDUCATION..... 23
Turf Battles..... 24
Child Care versus Elementary Education: The
Fundamental Differences..... 24
Teaching Philosophies..... 26
Program Content..... 27
Parental Responsibilities..... 28
Reaching the Necessary Compromises..... 29

V. FINANCING EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS: COSTS, QUALITY AND THE TRADEOFFS AMONG THEM..... 35
Types of Costs and the Difficulties of
Measuring Them..... 35
Costs and Indicators of Quality: The Tradeoffs..... 42
Potential and Comparative Program Costs..... 46

VI. THE CHOICES THE STATES FACE: POLICY OPTIONS IN EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS..... 53
Targeting Options..... 53
Funding Options..... 56
Options for Program Structure..... 57
Providing Funds to Parents..... 61
Multiprogram Funding..... 62
Administrative Options..... 63
Ensuring High Quality..... 64

VII. HOPES FOR CHILDREN..... 67

APPENDIX A: DATA SOURCES..... 71
REFERENCES..... 73

TABLES

1 RECENT INITIATIVES IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.....15
2 COSTS BY PROGRAM TYPE.....38
3 SALARIES FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD TEACHERS AND AIDES.....40
4 ADULT-CHILD RATIOS IN DIFFERENT PROGRAMS.....44
5 PER-PUPIL COSTS OF PRESCHOOL AND CHILDCARE PROGRAMS...47
6 OPTIONS AND ALTERNATIVE COSTS.....51
7 POLICY OPTIONS.....54

SUMMARY

The growing demand for pre-school education and other early childhood programs has prompted several states to enact new legislation and others to form commissions to study the feasibility of doing so. Despite its 150-year history, from the kindergarten and nursery school movements to Head Start and the legislative initiatives of the 1970s, the idea of extending schooling downward to younger children is just now reaching the realm of state policymaking and implementation.

The Issues

Many programs recently enacted by the states are limited pilot programs for half-day preschools which enroll "at-risk" four-year-olds, rather than comprehensive programs that provide both full-day child care and compensatory education. Policymaking in the field of early childhood education is still in its infancy, and most states have little experience in providing early childhood programs. Hence, the majority of states face a unique opportunity to create early childhood education policy de novo. However, reaching consensus in order to develop an effective policy will require reconciling three primary issues:

1. The historical rift between the "educational and "custodial" models of early childhood education
2. The historical conflicts between the elementary school and early childhood education communities over purposes, methods, and control.
3. The tradeoffs necessary between the costs of programs and their quality.

Early Childhood Education Models

The history of early childhood education has given us conflicting visions and a legacy of fragmentation. The "educational" or "developmental" model, embodied in the infant schools of the 1830s, the early kindergartens of the 1880s, the nursery schools of the 1920s, and various compensatory programs from the 1960s to the present (including Head Start), has emphasized the social and cognitive development of the child, often focusing on the greater developmental needs of poor children. The "custodial" model, epitomized by the day nurseries of the Progressive Era and the welfare-related child care programs that were begun in the 1960s, has emphasized the care of young children so that their mothers can work. The differences between these two models have been joined by other competing concerns, especially between early childhood educators and elementary educators.

These divisions persist in the current interest in early childhood. The recent state initiatives to establish preschool programs reflect many political influences, many of them apparently idiosyncratic, rather than concerted political action by parents, feminists, early childhood educators, or members of the school community. However, the larger forces that have stimulated interest in early childhood include the continued increase in the number of working women--leading to greater concern about the lack of good quality child care, a variant of the "custodial" model--and widespread recognition of the benefits of educating children (especially low-income and disadvantaged children) earlier, a current form of the "educational" model. Consequently, little consensus has been reached about what early childhood programs should accomplish, and a continuing gap exists between "care" and "education." Since this split is outdated and counter-productive, one goal of state policy might be to integrate the different strands of early childhood programs.

The Struggle for Control

Another conflict has existed at least since the kindergarten movement at the turn of the century--between elementary school educators and early childhood educators. While "turf"--control over jobs and revenue--is involved, the deepest differences are those of philosophy, methodology, and purpose. For instance, fundamental differences in classrooms exist between early childhood programs and elementary schools. Basic teaching philosophies vary dramatically between the two camps, also leading to differences in programmatic content and objectives. Most child-care centers and preschool programs in the country adopt (even if unconsciously) a Piagetian model, whereby children learn through their own experimentation and initiative. In contrast, most elementary school teachers implicitly follow a behaviorist model, whereby children learn through structured interaction with their teacher, and grading is used to indicate their success or failure. Finally, the two sides differ on the nature of parental participation in the learning activities of their children.

Fortunately, the "turf" debates appear to be less severe now than they have been in the past, and some accommodation of the two positions seems possible. The preschool programs that have recently been enacted by the states--usually administered by state departments of education to stress their educational purposes, but largely following good early childhood practice--as well as other models around the country provide evidence that educators and the early childhood community can work together.

Tradeoffs between Costs and Quality

Crucial as they are to state policymakers, the costs of early childhood programs have been difficult to estimate, and the tradeoffs

between costs and quality are especially troubling. Data on the costs of programs indicate how important teachers' salaries and adult/child in the ratios are to overall costs. Both elements are in turn linked to differences in the quality of various programs. Teachers' salaries, often low enough in early childhood programs to place teachers in poverty, have been blamed for high turnover rates. Adult/child ratios vary widely (partly under cost pressures), despite consensus in the early childhood community that ratios should not exceed 1:10. Programs that are run by schools tend to experience higher costs, because they often use teacher salary scales (rather than the lower salaries of childcare workers); exemplary programs also exhibit higher costs. One obvious implication is that it makes no sense to cite evidence about the educational benefits of exemplary, high-quality programs and then to enact programs with low expenditures, low ratios, low salaries, and inadequate teacher preparation.

Policy Directions

Reconciling the conflicts between these philosophical, operational, and resource components of early childhood programs is crucial to formulating careful policy decisions. Fortunately, an array of governmental and funding options are available for consideration by state policymakers in their efforts to create an early childhood policy. Specifically, states that formulate early childhood policies and enact new programs face major decisions and must reach consensus in seven primary areas:

1. Which children should be served?
2. How long should programs operate?
3. What level of funding should be provided, and how should state and local revenues and parent fees be used?
4. What types of funding mechanisms should be used?
5. Which state agency(ies) should be responsible for administering the early childhood education programs?
6. What types of quality controls should be instituted?
7. What forms of teacher preparation and certification should be required?

FOREWORD

The issue of providing programs for very young children is fast gaining high political visibility. Proponents point to the growing number of working mothers who need quality child care and to the conventional wisdom that children (especially those considered "at-risk") benefit from earlier schooling.

This paper reviews the historical conflicts within the early childhood movement and describes the current status of early childhood policy in the states. It also outlines the options from which policymakers can choose as they move toward an effective and coherent approach to early childhood education.

W. Norton Grubb, Ph.D is an economist and associate professor at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas-Austin. His continuing interest in programs for young children is reflected in his book Broken Promises: How Americans Fail Their Children (Basic Books 1982).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In preparing this paper, presentations at the annual conferences of the National Conference of State Legislatures and the Education Commission of the States were helpful, as were conversations with and comments from Helen Blank, Linda Bond, William Chance, Susan Fuhrman, Terry Gnezda, Jack Hailey, Lynn Kagan, Al Kahn, Sheila Kamerman, Fern Marx, Lorraine McDonnell, Hannah Meadows, Ann Mitchell, Gwen Morgan, Janice Mulnar, Deborah Phillips, Bella Rosenberg, June Sale, Tom Schultz, Larry Schweinhart, Sheldon White, and Marcy Whitebook.

W.N.G.
University of Texas at Austin
January 1987

INTRODUCTION

Young children make hot copy: they're cute, they need our protection, and everyone wants the best for them. But treasured as children are, taxpayers do not always want to spend public money on them. First, as everyone knows, children don't vote; thus, their political cause has always been weak. Second, for children younger than age six, public support has always vied with the idea that parents should be entirely responsible for their welfare. Third, for poor children, the most needy and most vulnerable, general antipathy toward their parents has often outweighed any sense of public responsibility. Americans are fond of proclaiming children as "our most precious natural resource," but they have seldom followed their rhetoric with public support (Grubb and Lazerson 1982a; Grubb 1986). Government programs for children have been on the defensive ever since the 1960s, and the decline in public funding for children--especially poor children--has been especially devastating (Grubb and Brody 1985; Kimmich 1985).

Against this background, the recent surge of interest in early childhood programs is an unexpected welcome to children's advocates. Since 1979, at least eleven states have enacted some form of early childhood education, and a few others have used their existing school-aid mechanisms to fund such programs in the schools. Several other states have formed commissions to study the options available to them, and prominent politicians and commissioners of education have begun to take up the cause of young children in more earnest. State-level coalitions of advocates for early childhood programs have sprung up, and a sense of progress has emerged for the first time since the 1960s (Gnezda and Robinson 1985; Children's Defense Fund 1985; Schweinhart 1985).

Still, such enthusiasm is not necessarily sufficient to win widespread support for new initiatives. Most of the recently enacted programs are small pilot projects, not commitments to large-scale funding of early childhood education. Although the idea of extending the education of children to younger ages has been prominent for almost 150 years, few political battles have been won in this arena, with the

exception of the kindergarten movement and the initiation of Head Start. Substantial confusion surrounds early childhood programs--their operational nature, their costs, their effects, their quality, and even their basic objectives--especially since most states have provided little of their own funding for early childhood programs and thus have little knowledge in this area. Turf battles persist, and the major professional communities with an interest in young children--educators in the public schools, early childhood educators, and the child-care community--often battle each other over basic philosophical objectives and methodologies, as well as over economic issues associated with jobs and administrative control. Without a coherent approach to policymaking in this area, the current interest in young children could easily fade without any major and effective programs to show for all the effort.

In this paper, I examine the basic policy issues in early childhood education. I first review the different objectives of such programs both historically (in Section I) and currently (in Section II). In the remainder of the paper, I address several issues that must be resolved before states can develop their own specific policies. In Section III, I discuss the content of early childhood programs, focusing on the substantive differences between preschool and child-care programs, and the philosophical conflict between elementary educators and early childhood educators. In Section IV, I examine the financing of early childhood education--including its costs, its effects on indicators of quality, and the tradeoffs that exist between costs and quality. Finally, in Section V, I discuss the governmental mechanisms and the options available to states, in light of the limited power of government to coerce or cajole changes in programs for young children and effect improvements in their quality.

As an area of governmental concern, early childhood policy is still in its infancy. The problems that must be resolved often seem hideously complex and the choices politically intractable; the legislator in search of calm might be tempted to move on to another arena. But we should keep in mind the overriding goals: to meet the needs of young children, and to redress widespread developmental and educational problems by "nipping them in the bud." To a parent, a

child who returns home from day care or school vibrant and anxious to return the next day, and showing obvious evidence of progress, is a wonderful sight. "What the best and wisest parent wants for his own child, that must the community want for all of its children," declared John Dewey; so, for policymakers, the prospects of improving the lives of young children should be well worth the effort.

I. THE HISTORICAL PERSISTENCE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

The proposal to extend schooling to younger-age children is an idea that every generation seems to rediscover for itself. This idea has been prompted by different motives--in turn educational, economic, and reformist, sometimes stressing the needs of children and sometimes forgetting the child in favor of social problems or the employment of teachers. Many such proposals have died, but their legacies have provided philosophical direction toward the education of young children and program models that continue to both influence and confuse us.

THE SEEDS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

The central goal of education in the early nineteenth century was political and moral--to provide the education necessary for citizens in a republic, citizens who were responsible, self-reliant, hard-working, and able to understand the importance of collective goals over individual ends. In the cities, education was deemed particularly important for poor children, whose parents "seldom kept any government in their family" and who therefore "unavoidably contracted habits of idleness and mischief and wickedness." Philanthropers began to support charity schools, the precursors of our free elementary schools. Others, intent on rescuing poor children from their allegedly harmful parents as early as possible, instituted infant schools for those as young as 18 months. The infant school movement, most active in the 1830s and 1840s, stimulated lively discussion about early childhood education, and even spawned some middle-class infant schools despite its target population of poor children (Kaestle 1983). Although the infant school movement died out as the view spread that mothers should care for their own children, its essential vision--that schools should enroll children at the youngest age possible, to teach them and protect them from the negative influences of home--lives on in many forms, including the current interest in compensatory education.

The kindergarten movement began in the 1880s as an extension of the ideal home, with teachers as surrogate mothers who emphasized the value of play to the child's development. Aside from a few early examples, kindergartens developed as part of urban reform around the

turn of the century: Philanthropists in several cities began to establish kindergartens to teach poor urban children--including many immigrant children--the value of industriousness, cleanliness, discipline, and cooperation, American ethics that their parents might not have been in a position to pass on. The kindergartens also worked actively with parents to instruct them in the care of their children. For the same reasons that the early charity schools became public schools, many kindergartens were incorporated into the public schools as a way to expand their funding and scope. However, this transition was difficult, because the kindergarten stressed active play time and freedom from adult restrictions (in contrast to the elementary grades), and emphasized the development of personal characteristics--what early childhood educators now call social and emotional development--rather than cognitive development. While supporters of kindergartens hoped to transform the schools, instead the methods and objectives of the kindergarten changed (Lazerson 1972; Grubb and Lazerson 1977). As a prominent early childhood educator reminisced in the early 1930s,

> In order to survive [in the public schools], we could not tell of the work we were doing with the families or with parents; we must try to prove as soon as possible that the children who had attended kindergarten could progress so much faster in the first grade. Consequently, we lost our splendid birthright of family welfare work and knowing the child in his home, and we began to work for very elementary forms of the three R's.

Just as the kindergarten was being incorporated into the public schools, a very different institution for young children began to develop, again in response to the poverty and adverse conditions of urban areas. These "day nurseries," which were being established by settlement houses, were like the charity kindergartens directed toward low-income children, particularly those whose mothers were forced to work. Their purpose was twofold:

> To provide a shelter for the children of mothers dependent on their own exertions for their daily bread; [but] also to rear useful citizens among the class represented by the children we reach.

However, because mothers were "supposed" to be caring for their own children rather than working, day nurseries became associated with socially and economically aberrant families and the "unworthy poor."

While the day nurseries themselves declined under such stigma, their legacy has been the "welfare" or "custodial" model of child care, which provides extended care to enable mothers of poor children to work.[1]

The "educational" model of programs for young children was revived in the nursery-school movement of the 1920s. Nursery schools developed as complements to rather than as "mother substitutes," and they were part-day rather than full-day programs, directed toward the cognitive enrichment of middle-class children. Another important objective of the nursery-school movement was "to educate the parents to a better understanding of their position in the scheme of the education of their children's lives"--that is, parent education. Some directors even maintained that nursery schools could not be justified without providing such education to parents (National Society for the Study of Education 1929). Because of their firm links to parents and to middle-class children, the nursery schools avoided the stigma associated with day nurseries. Even though nursery schools were not widespread, they provided a strong institutional image of what early childhood programs should represent, as well as an origin for contemporary early childhood education. With their success and the decline of the day nurseries, the split widened between self-consciously "educational" programs for young children and more obvious "custodial" programs.

LEGISLATIVE AND SOCIAL INFLUENCES: THE EMERGING DEBATE

Other institutional developments for the education of young children were temporary responses to specific crises. During the Depression, the Works Progress Administration established a series of federally funded nursery schools, primarily to provide employment for unemployed teachers. Since they were administered through state departments of education and local school boards, they developed an explicitly educational orientation. However, federal funds for such efforts were discontinued when the Depression ended. A few years later, in response to World War II, the Lanham Act provided funding for day-care centers to facilitate employing mothers for the war effort.

---

1. See Grubb and Lazerson (1982a), Ch. 8; and Steinfels (1973), especially Ch. 2.

While some of these centers were run by schools, their central objective was to provide care for children during working hours. Like the WPA nurseries, they were discontinued by legislators at the end of the crisis, without acknowledging their continued acceptability or applicability.

Once the kindergarten had become an accepted part of the public schools, the idea of extending schooling to even younger children kept emerging. In 1945, the Educational Policies Committee of the National Education Association recommended that schooling be extended to 3- and 4-year-olds, "closely integrated with the rest of the program of public education," especially to educate children "whose parents are not able by circumstance, nature, or training to give them the values inherent in a carefully directed program."[2] However, blocked by the ideology that mothers should remain in the home, these proposals failed to exert any widespread influence. Even though the number of working women was increasing steadily during the 1950s, the conventional position was that children who were cared for away from their homes were social aberrations. Even as late as 1963, the Children's Bureau declared that "the child who needs day care has a family problem which makes it impossible for his parents to fulfill their parental responsibilities without supplemental help" (Steinfels 1973).

In the 1960s, programs for young children experienced a renaissance. A new body of research--especially J. McVickar Hunt's Intelligence and Experience and Benjamin Bloom's Stability and Change in Human Development--was widely cited as confirmation of what the founders of the infant schools and kindergartens had always believed--that the early years are critical, and that slow development in the early years may be irremediable. Moreover, another "crisis"--this time, the realization of the severity of poverty--spurred the federal government to institute the Head Start Program. A centerpiece of the War on Poverty, Head Start was explicitly educational and compensatory, thus drawing on the "educational" strand of early childhood programs even though the children in Head Start were poor, not middle-class like the children of nursery schools (Zigler and Valentine 1979). Others

---

2. See Educational Policies Committee (1945), especially pp. 3 and 8.

proposed a similar model for all children, although without success; for example, the Education Policies Commission of the National Education Association recommended in 1966 that "all children should have an opportunity to go to school at public expense at the age of four," relying on the convention that the first five years of life are crucial to subsequent development (Frost 1969).

Head Start has never pretended to provide full day child care, since most of its programs operate only for a half day; thus it has not bridged the gap between the "educational" model and the "custodial" model of day nurseries and child care. (Even "full-day" programs in Head Start tend to operate only until mid-afternoon.) The other federal programs of the 1960s that were targeted toward young children were more obviously attempts to provide child care. Part of the War on Poverty was the "services strategy," an attempt to provide various training and counseling services to welfare mothers to help them escape poverty. One of the services offered was child care, first as part of the Social Security Amendments of 1967, later under the Title XX program of aid for social services, and now included in the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG). These programs, which are part of the welfare system and are explicitly designed to reduce poverty, became the archetype of the "welfare" approach to child care, emphasizing low costs and custodial care over the child's education. To be sure, the early federal regulations that governed the program--the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements--did specify that all programs contain an educational component, but this requirement has not been enforced and has often been ignored. Thus, the major federal programs of the 1960s also did nothing to bridge the gap between "educational" programs and welfare-related "custodial" programs.

Along with the initiation of early childhood programs and an increase in the number of women who were working, proposals and legislative initiatives multiplied during the 1970s. Major federal legislation to expand support for child care was introduced in 1971, 1975, 1976, and 1979; however, all efforts were defeated, partly because of attacks from anti-feminist conservatives, and partly because of reactions against government intervention and the Great Society. Nonetheless, the growth of day care and the existence of Head Start

prompted growing interest in early childhood education, and educators began paying more attention to early childhood programs.[3]

In the midst of the battles over federal funding, the American Federation of Teachers proposed that the public schools control federally-subsidized early childhood and day care programs, arguing that the schools were dedicated to education, that professionalism would improve the low quality of existing care, and that the schools already had a well-developed organizational structure (AFT Task Force on Educational Issues 1976). However, with the looming surplus of teachers, many interpreted this argument as a self-serving attempt to put unemployed teachers back to work. Moreover, the early childhood community rose to the attack, arguing that elementary teachers were inappropriately trained to care for young children, and that the schools were rigid, uncommitted to young children, and hostile toward certain parents (Grubb and Lazerson 1977; Fishhaut and Pastor 1977). The episode revealed the deep rift between educators and the early childhood community, although the demise of federal legislation made the debate moot.

The legacy of this history, then, is fragmentation and paradox. The historical rift has continued between "educational" programs for young children and "custodial" programs which provide care while parents work. Another split has emerged between "custodial" care designed to reduce welfare costs, whose quality must frequently be compromised, and the ideal of high quality child care that most working parents seek. Still another argument, between elementary educators and early childhood educators, has been reopened for the first time since the kindergarten movement. The increase in the number of working women has pitted those who argue for higher quality child care against those who bitterly oppose such care on the grounds that mothers belong at home. Finally, the view that early childhood is a crucial stage of development has become widely accepted, but until recently Head Start was embattled, and other proposals for governmental support have

---

3. See, for example, National School Public Relations Association (1973). This document claimed support for earlier schooling from the Council of Chief State School Officers, the American Association of School Administrators, and the American Federation of Teachers.

languished. The cause of young children seems important, but government support for early childhood programs has remained weak.

II. THE CURRENT MOVEMENT: THE CONFLICTING OBJECTIVES OF EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS

In the past few years, political interest in young children has been revived. In contrast to earlier programs for young children, which since the 1930s have been federal efforts, the recent initiatives have come from the states. Since 1979, at least 11 states and New York City have enacted legislation to support early childhood programs (see Table 1); in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia, existing mechanisms to finance the regular school programs are being used to support early childhood education.[4] Still other states have formed commissions to study their options for implementing early childhood programs, and such programs have received support from several prominent politicians and educational leaders, including governors Castle of Delaware and Snelling of Vermont, the state education commissioners of New York and Connecticut, and Mayor Koch of New York City. The National Governors' Association has also supported early childhood programs as one of several proposals to "help at-risk children succeed in meeting the new educational requirements," thereby explicitly linking early childhood programs to the "excellence" movement and the school reforms of the past few years (National Governors Association 1986).

Some other states have recently enacted programs that can best be described as parent-education initiatives, since they involve a few hours of parents' time per week over several months and emphasize the parent-child interaction. Such programs include Minnesota's well-publicized Early Childhood Family Education Program and Missouri's new Parents as First Teachers, a program of parental education, developmental screening, and early childhood education for developmentally delayed children. While new parent-education programs provide additional evidence of interest in young children, they are

---

4. The preschool program in California is omitted in Table 1, since it is not a recent program and is only a small part of California's early childhood program; it would be misleading to include it without describing the entire range of programs available in California.

both conceptually and financially different from preschool and child-care programs, and, hence, will not be examined further in this paper.

POTENTIAL INFLUENCES AND POLICY INITIATIVES

Most of the recent early childhood legislation described in Table 1 has enacted half-day preschool programs administered by state departments of education and run by local school districts; most are still quite limited in scope, and can best be termed pilot projects. These initiatives of the states, which have historically committed very little of their own revenues to early childhood programs,[5] have been welcomed by child advocates, but they remain somewhat puzzling. In several states--Texas, South Carolina, Massachusetts, and South Carolina--additional funding for prekindergarten programs came as part of more general educational reforms. These revisions were themselves responses to the movement for higher standards and educational "excellence" that has swept the states since 1983. In these states, higher educational standards have in turn generated the necessity for more remedial programs, providing a rationale for compensatory efforts at the prekindergarten level. In some states, including Washington, Texas, Kentucky, and Connecticut, blue-ribbon commissions have supported early childhood; however, such support has often been provided by one or two commission members--frequently those who have heard about evaluations of early childhood programs--rather than by a more widespread constituency. In several cases, individual politicians--such as Mayor Koch in New York and Governor Castle of Delaware--have championed the cause of young children; in Rhode Island, support both from female legislators and from the Lieutenant Governor, Richard Leicht, was crucial to the new interest in early childhood.[6]

---

5. The only real exception to this pattern is California, which operates an impressive array of early childhood programs funded from state and local revenues. New York has also funded early childhood programs since 1966. Prior to 1984, no other state spent more than $3 million of its own funds for early childhood programs. See Schweinhart (1985), Table 20.

6. Information on the political forces behind the recent early childhood education programs comes from Morado (1985); Grubb et al. (1985), Ch. 8; conferences of the Education Commission of the States and the National Conference of State Legislatures; and personal communications from William Chance, Lynn Kagan, and Terry Gnezda.

Table 1

RECENT INITIATIVES IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Population served	Hours of operation	Numbers served/ resources	Ratios	ECE training	Method of funding
District of Columbia (enacted 1968)					
4-year-olds	51 full-day 69 half-day	3,300 children $2.9 million	1:10 (half day) 1:15 (full day)	yes	Local district funding since 1982; previously Chapter I funds
Florida (begun 1986)					
Migrant children 3-4	full-day	1,528 children in 100 programs	1:10	no	Some Ch. I funds. Districts may subcontract to private non-profits
Florida (enacted 1986; begun 1986-87)					
Children 3-4; 50% must be disadvantaged	local option	8 pilot projects 650 children; $750,000 (1986-87)	local option	yes	Project grants to school districts
Illinois (enacted 1985; begun Jan. 1986)					
Children 3-5 "at risk"	half or full day	7,400 children in 234 districts 12.1 million	none;1:8 preferred	yes	Project grants, up to one per district; no local match
Louisiana (enacted 1985; begun fall 1985)					
4-year-olds "at risk"	mostly full day	1,000 children in 37 of 66 districts $2.1 million	1:10 with aide; 1:15 without	no	Project grants, 1-4 grants per district; no local match
Maine (enacted 1979)					
4-year-olds	most half-day; some 2 days/week	656 children $1.6 million	no limit	no	Funded through the regular school aid program
Maryland (enacted 1979)					
4-year olds	half-day	2,225 children in 55 schools $2.25 million	1:10	yes	Project funding; schools selected based on low test scores

TABLE 1 (continued)

Population served	Hours of operation	Numbers served/ resources	Ratios	ECE training	Method of funding
Massachusetts (enacted 1985); begun fall 1986)					
varied-- program discretion	half-day or full-day	Unknown	being developed (probably 1:10)	yes*	Competitive grants to districts, mostly low-income
Michigan (pilot projects Jan.-Sept. 1986)					
4-year olds "at risk"	mostly half-day	400-500 children in 23 projects	1:10	no	Project grants to school at districts, providing 30% of funding
New Jersey (since 1903)					
4-year-olds	half day	6,029 children in 93 districts	1:25	no**	Funding through the regular school aid program
New York State (enacted 1967)					
4-year olds 90% disadvantaged	mostly half-day	9,300 children in 75 districts $20 million, $2,600/child	1:7.5	no	Project grants with 11% local funding
New York City (enacted 1986; implemented 1986-87)					
low-income 4-year-olds	half day	2,600 children $6.7 million	1:10	yes	Project grants, with high-need areas targeted
Ohio (1985-86)					
3-5 year-olds	2 with 2 half-days/week; 1 full-day	120 children in 3 pilot projects $60,000 total	1:12	no*	Project grants to districts; personnel costs paid locally
Oklahoma (enacted 1980)					
4-year-olds	half-day or full-day	1,400 children in 34 programs $1 million	1:10	yes	Project grants to school districts

TABLE 1 (continued)

Population served	Hours of operation	Numbers served/ resources	Ratios	ECE training	Method of funding
Pennsylvania (since 1965)					
4-year-olds	half-day or full-day	unknown	no regs	unknown	Regular state aid formula for kindergartens used
South Carolina (enacted 1984)					
4-year-olds with deficient "readiness"	half-day	6,500 children $8.7 million, $1,053/child	1:10	yes	Allocation to each district based on students "not ready"
Texas (enacted 1984; begun fall 1985)					
4-year-olds, low income or limited English	half-day	35,000 children in 495 districts $29.5 million	1:22 (with exemptions)	yes	Matching grant with state match based on local property value
Washington (enacted 1985)					
four-year-olds, Head Start eligibility	mostly half-day	1,000 children $2.9 million, $2,700/child	1:6	yes	Funds to Head Start agencies or schools; priority to districts with most at-risk children

*New early childhood credentials are being developed in Massachusetts and Ohio.
**In Louisiana a nursery or kindergarten certificate is preferred; in New Jersey most teachers have a nursery endorsement.

SOURCES: Gnezda and Robinson 1985; Children's Defense Fund 1985; Schweinhart 1985

Thus, the political influences have been varied and idiosyncratic. With a few exceptions--especially South Carolina, whose recent educational reforms involved a broad spectrum of citizens and educators--little evidence exists of concerted political action by educators themselves, the early childhood education community, the women's movement, or parents, the groups that have the greatest stake in promoting programs for young children.

SOCIAL INFLUENCES

The broader influences that have contributed to the sudden interest in early childhood programs are clearer. One has been the growing prevalence of working mothers, a fact that has become increasingly obvious--and is obviously irreversible--to educators, child-care providers, employers, feminists, and even anti-feminists. In 1986, 54.4 percent of mothers with children under age 6 were in the labor force, up from 46.8 percent in 1980, 38.8 percent in 1975, and 25.3 percent in 1965. The increase in the number of working mothers has been especially rapid for those who live with their husbands, a group that traditionally remained at home; their rate of working has increased from 16 percent in 1955 to 23 percent in 1965, 37 percent in 1975, and 54 percent in 1986.[7] To be sure, these trends are hardly novel, since the rate of labor-force participation by women has been increasing at least since 1890; but passing the "magical" 50 percent rate has underscored the fact that the trend is irreversible, and that working is now the norm for women rather than an aberration. In addition, because about two-thirds of women with children under age 6 work full time, part-time programs--such as traditional preschools and nursery schools--are insufficient. Many advocates have complained that the amount and quality of child care available to parents--even those who are able to pay for high-quality care--are inadequate. The high cost of child care to low-income parents has been a special concern to others.

---

7. The most recent figures are from U.S. Bureau of Labor (1986); also see Hayghe (1986). For earlier data, see U.S. Department of Labor, 1982, Table C-11.

A different strand of support has emphasized the wisdom of educating children earlier, particularly low-income and other disadvantaged children. The dominant educational reform of the 1980s--the movement for "excellence," emphasizing higher academic standards--has coexisted with a growing alarm about drop-out rates and illiteracy, especially among poor and minority high school students. Earlier schooling promises one mechanism for meeting both the necessity of remediation and the demands for "excellence" simultaneously. The link between the two has been made most explicit by those states which have adopted preschool programs as part of more general educational reforms, and by the National Governors' Association Task Force on Readiness to Meet the New Standards in advocating early childhood programs to help "at-risk" children prepare for school.

The current wave of interest owes a great deal to the publicity surrounding one project in particular--the Perry Preschool program. Because of the substantial amount of money devoted to publicizing the program, its results supporting the advantages of early childhood programs have become widely cited, especially its benefit/cost ratio of 7:1. Despite the fact that few reformers know what this program entailed or what its actual costs were, it seems that in the search for educational solutions the reformers have latched onto the Perry Preschool program as the latest panacea. Since the Perry Preschool was only one tiny program, with extraordinary expenditures and unique circumstances (as noted later), its results might be dismissed as ungeneralizable. Fortunately, studies of other early childhood programs confirm that well-designed and carefully implemented programs can have consistent positive effects on early childhood development.[8]

A final element of current interest in early childhood programs, more recent and somewhat less important, comes from those who are promoting "workfare" as a solution to poverty. Workfare proposals of

---

[8]. On the Perry Preschool, see Berreuta-Clement et al. (1984). For other studies, see the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies (1983); and Lazar and Darlington (1982). For a recent review of the effects of Head Start, see McKey et al. (1985). The methodology of this latter report has been attacked, especially for failing to consider the quality of evaluation studies and the quality of the programs being evaluated. Also see Schweinhart and Weikart (1986); and Gamble and Zigler, unpublished.

course have a long history; they have gained renewed prominence not only because of the conservative drift of the country, but also because of the generally positive though modest results of the workfare experiments initiated in the early 1980s. Current workfare programs tend to be less punitive than such plans have traditionally been, concentrating more on providing education, counseling, and other services to facilitate employment. For welfare mothers with children older than age 6, the provision of after-school care becomes a crucial need, as does regular preschool care for those with children younger than age 6. Thus, the potential expansion of workfare programs will require increases in public support for child care--not for "developmental" or "educational" purposes, to be sure, but as part of the "custodial" rationale for child care.

RESOLVING THE COMPETING CONCERNS

The major reasons for the current interest in young children obviously replicate the historic divisions among early childhood programs. The concerns of working parents and their advocates represent, in a way, the heirs of the "custodial" model of child care--with the exception that no parent would support low-quality care. Those who are promoting workfare programs are also driven to support the "custodial" model of child care and after-school care in its most obvious form. Those who are promoting the compensatory education of young children continue to cite the benefits of earlier intervention for poor and disadvantaged children.

But these strands of thought immediately imply a conflict among goals. The "educational" strand usually promotes half-day programs--that is, programs which last two and a half to three hours a day during the school year; but such programs offer little help to full-time working parents, who need their children placed in care for nine hours a day throughout the entire year. Conversely, purely "custodial" programs may not provide the self-consciously educational experience envisioned by the proponents of the Perry Preschool program and other model programs. Inconsistencies abound: some advocates mention the increasing number of working women, and then press for half-day programs that are inappropriate for most working mothers. Others note

that, because of increases in full-time child care, a greater number of young children are cared for outside their homes, and they use this fact to argue for the appropriateness of earlier schooling.

Right at the start, then, a conflict exists over the basic purpose of early childhood programs, a split that has crucial implications for the hours of program operations, programmatic philosophy and content, the training requirements for those who will work with young children, and the costs of the program. But while this division has deep historical roots, it is no longer appropriate to maintain the distinction between "developmental" and "custodial" programs. One reason is that the reality of working mothers has undermined the utility of the older "developmental" model; nursery schools, which had traditionally been half-day programs, have generally evolved into full-day programs for working parents. Furthermore, most children can no longer attend half-day programs; for example, in Texas, many superintendents felt that the required prekindergarten programs would be underenrolled because working mothers would not send their children to a half-day program (Grubb et al. 1985). This problem is particularly serious for mothers without husbands at home--mothers of children who are the most likely to be considered at-risk and eligible for remedial programs--since they have especially high rates of labor-force participation and full-time employment.

Conversely, the view that the early years are important to development has become conventional wisdom. Most child-care centers have adopted a conscious policy about a developmental curriculum; many devote some time during the day to formal instruction, and most clearly provide a variety of developmental goals for the children in their care. Indeed, many child-care workers call themselves teachers and consider themselves professionals, deeply resenting the notion that they are merely "babysitters." The idea that child care is merely "custodial" is badly outdated.

Above all, the idea that early childhood programs should be either "developmental" or "custodial" will only limit such programs. After all, the schools are rich, multipurpose institutions in which economic, political, moral, and avocational objectives coexist. At their best, early childhood programs are similarly rich and

multifaceted, providing cognitive, physical, social, and emotional development for children, the security of full-time child care for working parents, a cooperative understanding between parents and caregivers, and parent education for those who seek different ways of interacting with their children. The best programs provide children with early, noncompetitive, and nonthreatening experiences in an integrated setting with children of other racial and class backgrounds, rather than segregating "at-risk" children from others in special classes. To search for a single purpose for early childhood programs is to destroy this vision of what early childhood programs could be.

Thus one possible goal of state policy should be to eliminate the deep division between "developmental" and "custodial" programs, and between preschool and child care. However, the recent initiatives from the states have given little thought to this possibility. As shown in Table 1, most of the recent initiatives have created half-day preschool programs for at-risk children, administered by state education agencies and local school districts without any connection to existing child-care programs (public or private)--although a few states (Illinois, South Carolina, Florida, Massachusetts, and Michigan) permit districts to subcontract with private child-care agencies. At the same time, different legislative committees and different agencies in the states have been making decisions about Title XX/SSBG child-care programs; at least thirteen states have substantially increased the funds available for child care--but with no relation to schools or to experimental preschools.[9] Of course, a variety of fiscal, philosophical, and administrative barriers to integrating the strands of early childhood programs exist, none of which can easily be toppled. But the goal of integration is important, since the alternative is either a limited vision of what programs for young children can be or a set of programs which are less effective than they could be.

---

9. This conclusion is based on unpublished data collected by the Children's Defense Fund on 1985 and 1986 comparisons.

III. PHILOSOPHY AND TURF: THE SPLIT BETWEEN EARLY CHILDHOOD AND ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

The split between "custodial" approaches and "developmental" programs, undesirable in itself, has been replicated in another form. At least since the turn of the century and the kindergarten movement, a division has existed between teachers and administrators in early childhood programs and those in elementary school programs. This division has taken several forms encompassing both functional and philosophical considerations. Understanding the conflicts between the two camps is necessary because the content of early childhood programs may depend on which side controls these programs--or alternatively on what kind of compromise can be achieved.

The rift between early childhood and elementary school programs emerged with some force in the 1970s, and the early childhood community still fears that the control of public schools over programs for young children could ruin early childhood education (Morgan 1986; National Association for the Education of Young Children 1986a). The reasons for this division are not always apparent, since neither side has been especially articulate about the differences. Elementary educators have often referred to early childhood programs as "babysitting," without acknowledging the educational purpose of such programs, while teachers of young children have castigated the schools as rigid, didactic, and above all ignorant of the needs of young children. The debate has sometimes been framed in overly simplistic terms--whether 4-year-olds should be either in <u>school</u> (including preschools) or in <u>care</u> (as in child care)--without defining the terms or recognizing the vast operational or structural differences between the two.[10] Both sides have compared the best of one with the worst of the other: elementary educators have compared the most exciting, child-oriented classrooms with the worst custodial child care, while early childhood educators point to exemplary programs for young children and caricature all elementary schools as rigid and archaic.

---

10. See, for example, the <u>Christian Science Monitor</u> series on "Schooling: When Should It Begin" beginning March 28, 1986.

TURF BATTLES

Not surprisingly, one argument between the two camps has involved "turf"--that is, who will control jobs and revenue. When the American Federation of Teachers proposed in the mid-1970s that public schools be the prime sponsors of federally funded programs, it was widely interpreted as an attempt to secure jobs for elementary teachers, who were then facing job shortages because of declining enrollments. More recently, debate erupted in New York City about who would control new funds for early childhood programs; the resolution was to divide funds equally between the public schools and the Agency for Child Development, which administers publicly funded child-care programs. These turf issues have been especially acute for the early childhood education community, where salaries are so low and jobs are so few; even though public school teaching is not a high-status profession, it still has a stature and a stability that the early childhood education profession lacks.

However, the turf issues should not be quite as serious at the moment, due to the shortage rather than a surplus of school teachers. Instead, the deepest differences are those which pertain to philosophy, methodology, and purpose--the same issues that caused a rift between the kindergarten movement and the schools around the turn of the century. These differences are difficult to reconcile, because certain practices that are deeply embedded in the schools and are resistant to change are anathema to early childhood educators.

CHILD CARE VERSUS ELEMENTARY EDUCATION: THE FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCES

One reason that it is difficult to specify the differences between early childhood programs and elementary education is the wide variety of each type of program. There are rigid and didactic forms of early childhood programs as well as versions that are relatively free and open, and highly structured and routinized elementary schools coexist with informal, child-oriented elementary settings associated with "open classrooms" and the free-school movement. But the differences between the two approaches to education are real, and they can readily be seen by comparing a typical child-care classroom with a typical elementary classroom, both of moderately good quality.

In the child-care setting, children are likely to be moving among different activity centers with a relatively high noise level. Periodically, a teacher will group all children together for instruction, reading, or some version of an assembly (chapel; temple; or an outside visitor, such as a firefighter), but formal instruction is typically limited to perhaps a half-hour per day, and the children are usually free to choose their own activities. The progression of activities throughout the day is geared to the capacity and attention span of small children and the rhythms of child care: early and late periods tend to be absorbed in free play because the arrival and departure of children at different times can be disruptive; instruction is limited to short periods, usually in mid-morning, when young children are most alert; and scheduling is generally flexible. Teachers circulate to ensure that all children are engaged in an activity, to provide guidance and informal instruction to individual children (rather than large groups), and to prevent disruptions; they are "guides and facilitators," rather than instructors. Rooms are arranged to allow both areas for privacy and "public" areas for different activities; each child has a cubby for his or her personal belongings, but not an individual desk. To the untrained observer, the classroom seems to have little planning or structure, but in fact structure is pervasive if covert--in the arrangement of the classroom, in the constant monitoring by the teacher and his or her interaction with children, and in the progression of activities throughout the day.

In contrast, elementary classrooms are dominated by the lessons that are taught to the children by teachers; "teacher talk" is pervasive (Sirotnik 1983). Children are seated at individual desks, sometime arranged in "islands" but often in rows; children may have some freedom to go to activity centers when they have finished assigned lessons, but they have much less freedom to choose the types of those activities. A classroom at work is likely to be humming, but in general the noise level is much lower than in child-care classrooms; order and quiet are intrinsically much more important goals, not merely instrumental to learning. The day begins and ends at prescribed times, and the scheduling of subjects is much more regular and rigid than in child care.

Of course, class size is usually much smaller in early childhood programs than in the elementary grades. Smaller classes are not simply more pleasant; large classes force the teacher to exercise control and order rather than to provide interaction and guidance, and mean that instruction must be formal, group-oriented, and didactic rather than informal, individualized, and interactive. Large classes also make the child-initiated activities that early childhood educators emphasize more difficult to implement.

TEACHING PHILOSOPHIES

The differences in classroom appearance are not simply happenstance; the basic philosophy of teaching and learning varies dramatically between early childhood programs and the schools.[11] Most child-care centers and preschool programs in this country adopt a Piagetian model of children (even if unconsciously): children are active learners, and learn by initiating activity and by experimenting (including playing); the teacher's role is to facilitate rather than to direct the child's learning. In contrast, most elementary teachers implicitly follow a behaviorist model, in which the child is a tabula rasa, an empty vessel into which lessons are poured by the teacher, using grades as the carrot and success or failure as the stick. The inappropriateness of behaviorist approaches has recently been highlighted for the early childhood community by research that has examined three curriculum models: a behaviorist approach; the Perry Preschool curriculum, based on Piagetian thought; and a child-centered nursery school model with more free play than the Piagetian model. While all three had similar effects on cognitive outcomes, children in the behaviorist program later experienced higher delinquency, worse relationships with their parents, and less participation in school sports and school officeholding (Schweinhart, Weikart, and Larner 1986).

With the importance of rewards and punishment in the behaviorist model, the schools have developed highly formalized assessment

---

11. Good information on the differences between the schools and the early childhood programs comes from two position statements by the National Association for Education of Young Children (1986a,b).

mechanisms, including grades and tests, in contrast to the much more informal assessments of progress--often little more than checklists--that are used by child-care centers and preschool programs. One deep fear of early childhood educators is that the emphasis on formal evaluation and assessment in the elementary classroom would, if extended to earlier years, bring the devastating experience of failure to young children, with such detrimental consequences as poor self-esteem, lower expectations of subsequent teachers, and placement in lower tracks. Partly because black children so often experience this type of treatment in the schools, the Black Child Development Institute has condemned school sponsorship of early childhood programs as an "incubator for inequality." (NBCDI 1985)

PROGRAM CONTENT

Another division between early childhood programs and elementary education pertains to the scope of education. Although the objectives of public education encompass vocational preparation, political and moral education, cultural development, and instruction in such practical subjects as driver education and sex education, the elementary grades have focused more clearly on basic cognitive skills, emphasizing the manipulation of symbols and the mastery of facts: reading; writing and other "language arts"; arithmetic; and study skills in such subjects as social studies. In contrast, early childhood programs uniformly place cognitive skills development--"pre-reading" and "pre-math"--alongside social skills (especially the behavior appropriate in group settings), the ability to recognize and control emotions, and the development of fine and gross motor skills. Early childhood advocates generally fear that educators would convert programs for young children into more "school-like" settings by reducing the importance of noncognitive goals, and by emphasizing one type of learning (epitomized by the "3 Rs" and rote memorization) over more creative, independent, and active forms of cognition. Certainly, the current attention to preschool programs as mechanisms of compensatory education can only strengthen this fear, since the most

important criterion of success in compensatory programs is later success in school, especially as measured by standardized tests.

Early childhood advocates place great value on the flexibility and variety of programs, since the schedules and curricular preferences of parents, and the learning styles and personalities of young children, vary so much. A similar ethic exists within elementary education: the ideals of local control, individualized instruction, and teacher autonomy all argue for variation within and among classrooms, responding to local conditions, the preferences of parents, and differences among students. But, despite these claims, elementary classrooms look remarkably similar across the country, exhibiting little variation in teaching methods or content (Sirotnik 1983). Certainly, the hours of operation--a crucial issue to working parents--vary only in trivial ways. Consequently, early childhood advocates have complained that the control of preschools by elementary schools would eliminate the variety of programs that now exist, standardizing and making current practices more rigid. From their side, educators, policymakers, and parents often perceive as chaos the variety that early childhood advocates extol, with abysmal "custodial" programs and unregulated facilities coexisting with sophisticated, high-quality programs, all marching under the banner of variety and flexibility. On this particular issue, the problem is obviously to develop a system that will permit flexibility and variety without allowing chaos to reign or quality to vary intolerably.

PARENTAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Finally, early childhood educators and elementary educators differ with respect to the roles of parents. A shibboleth of early childhood practice is that parents must be involved in the care of their children, because consistency and support between home and program are crucial. Many advocates like to cite evidence from early Head Start evaluations and other sources that the involvement of parents enhances the development of children. (Of course, parental involvement can vary enormously; it can be highly formalized, as in parent-education programs or parent councils, or it can take the informal approach of

frequent consultations between parents and teachers.) Early childhood advocates fear that the public schools, with a weak commitment to parental involvement and a history of condescension toward certain parents (especially parents of poor and minority children), would abandon any pretext of including parents if they ran preschool programs. This fear recalls the kindergarten movement and its loss of contact with parents as kindergartens moved into the schools.

However, as is true with the variety and flexibility of classroom settings, the issue of parental participation is complex. While every textbook in child development stresses the importance of parents, promoting parental participation in child care and preschool programs is difficult in practice. Working parents often have hectic schedules, and some are hostile to further demands on their time; some fail to see the value of marginal participation; some administrators resent the additional burdens that might be imposed by parents; and some facilities--especially proprietary day-care centers--will not tolerate any intrusions on their operations, much as corporations rail against any infringement on "free enterprise." How to develop effective parental participation remains a difficult issue, despite the greater commitment of early childhood educators.

Thus, the differences between elementary education and early childhood education are not merely turf battles over jobs; they reflect basic differences in conceptions of learning, in the roles of parents and teachers, in the training necessary for teachers, and in the objectives of educational programs. However, the real question for future policy is not whether these differences exist, but whether they can be contained and narrowed--whether educators and early childhood advocates can reach some compromise. Only then would it be possible to use the existing institutional structure of the educational system--certainly the best-developed structure available to the states, and the only institution now providing social programs to a large number of children--to administer early childhood programs while still ensuring that the content of these programs is appropriate for young children.

REACHING THE NECESSARY COMPROMISES

One way to answer this question is to examine the nature and structure of the early childhood programs that are currently operated

by the public schools--to ask whether they replicate elementary classrooms, or whether they appear to resemble model early childhood programs more closely. The programs recently initiated by states provide some guidance (see, again, Table 1). Most of these programs contain at least two elements that are crucial to the success of early childhood programs: their teacher-pupil ratios are high, around 1:10 (with the conspicuous exceptions of Texas, Maine, and New Jersey), and most of them require or prefer that teachers have training in early childhood education, a crucial element to the quality of programs for young children. In addition, most of them require some form of parental involvement, consistent with good practice in early childhood programs (Gnezda and Robinson 1986). Once in operation, these state programs may come under the influence of elementary administrators and bend in the direction of elementary goals and methods, but at the outset they have provided evidence that states can legislate programs for young children under elementary-school control that resemble early childhood programs, not just downward extensions of kindergarten.

Other evidence comes from early childhood programs that have been operated by the public schools for longer periods of time. Many Head Start programs--about 20 percent of them--are administered by school districts, and little evidence is available to suggest that the programs run by school districts and those operated by other agencies differ markedly.[12] Over the past two decades, some local districts have developed a variety of early childhood and child-care programs on their own; some have instituted preschool programs with Chapter I funds, and others have developed after-school programs and parent-education programs.[13] To be sure, many such efforts have been short-lived, and

---

12. School district-based programs more often require that their teachers hold a B.A. degree, and tend to pay them more because they often use a school teacher salary scale; however, no other differences seem to emerge. Instead, because of the great variety of Head Start programs, all among-group differences are small compared with within-group differences. (Oral communication, Esther Kresh, Administration for Children, Youth, and Families.)

13. A High/Scope survey of early childhood education programs in large city schools found that 24 of 26 districts ran some type of prekindergarten program in 1985-86; 7 were Head Start programs, 11 were funded by Chapter I, 15 were supported by state or local revenue, and

most of them have had to struggle for funding. However, their existence illustrates that schools are not always the inflexible, unimaginative institutions that early childhood educators portray them.

California provides perhaps the best evidence about the compromises that can be made when education and early childhood education work together. In California, school districts have operated full-day programs for children ages 2 to 5 ever since World War II. The Children's Centers are relatively well-funded, and offer higher teacher salaries and exhibit higher teacher-child ratios (and therefore higher costs) than most child-care centers. They provide full-day child care, but they also emphasize cognitive development and usually have well-developed curricula and assessment methods. They illustrate that schools can be quite innovative in designing early childhood programs: a few districts have developed networks of family day-care homes as alternatives to center-based care, and others have contracted with community-based organizations to provide care. Compared with community-based child-care programs, the Children's Centers are more cognitively oriented, are more consistently pulled in the direction of school-type practices (such as curriculum development and more formalized assessment mechanisms), and they have slightly less parental involvement. But the potential excesses of school-based programs are generally held in check, partly because the state's department of education is relatively sophisticated about early childhood issues, because teachers must have a Children's Center permit that requires training in early childhood education, and because an active early childhood community monitors and advises the Children's Centers.[14]

At the other extreme, the Texas prekindergarten program enacted in 1984 illustrates the fears of early childhood advocates. The

---

15 were special education (oral communication, Larry Schweinhart). Some of the early childhood programs developed by public schools in the 1970s are profiled in James Levine (1978). A comprehensive census of school-based programs being undertaken by the Public School Early Childhood Study at Bank St. College and Wellesley College will be available in spring 1987.

14. Information on the California Children's Centers comes from Grubb and Lazerson, "Child Care, Government Financing, and the Public Schools," updated by conversations with Jack Hailey and June Sale.

legislation, drafted with little consultation from the education community and none whatsoever from the early childhood community, requires that prekindergarten programs be operated in every district with at least fifteen eligible children. Districts were generally unprepared for this aspect of the comprehensive reform legislation; while some administrators were enthusiastic about the program--especially those who had already developed preschool programs using Chapter I funds, and those who had heard about the Perry Preschool and Head Start research--others were hostile to early childhood programs as mere "babysitting." Very few districts have had any experience with early childhood programs, and the Texas Department of Education does not employ trained personnel who might offer guidance and advice in early childhood programs, as the education department in California does. The maximum class size of twenty-two students far exceeds the ratios recommended by early childhood education groups, and a preference for teachers with "teacher of young children" certificates has been relaxed because of the shortage of such teachers. Some districts have been able to develop strong programs on their own, and others can use state funds to expand pre-existing programs, but the state's legislation does not encourage exemplary programs.[15]

Evidently, then, it is possible for early childhood programs in the schools to combine the best of both worlds, and it is also possible to legislate inappropriate programs of low quality. Therefore, states must reconcile the two worlds of education and child care, or "developmental" and "custodial" programs, though doing so requires that they pay close attention to the quality and content of the programs they enact. Unfortunately, as illustrated by the recent movement for "excellence" in education, legislating content and quality is difficult. The mechanisms by which states can improve quality and direct the nature of educational programs are limited; legislating quality in early childhood programs is even more difficult, because there is still little consensus about what quality means, and too much

---

15. It should be noted, for example, that since the 1970s Dallas has run a prekindergarten program with a 1:11 ratio, and plans to continue that ratio with new state money. For information on the Texas program, see Grubb et al. (1985), Ch. 8.

disagreement about objectives, curricula, teacher training, the role of parents, and other basic elements. Nonetheless, some legislative direction about quality is absolutely crucial, both as a way to reconcile the conflicts between elementary educators and early childhood advocates and as a way to realize the benefits of exemplary programs.

IV. FINANCING EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS: COSTS, QUALITY, AND THE TRADEOFFS AMONG THEM

The issue of government finance, never an easy one for social programs, is especially difficult for early childhood programs. Some programs, including several exemplary models, are enormously expensive; the specter of spending exorbitant amounts for new programs, on top of existing commitments to the public schools and the welfare system, is hardly appealing. Calculating the costs of early childhood programs is difficult, and the tradeoffs between cost and quality inexorable. Children may be our most precious natural resource, an investment in society's future, but replacing rhetoric with revenue has proved difficult.

TYPES OF COSTS AND THE DIFFICULTY OF MEASURING THEM

Because the expenditures of early childhood programs have rarely been examined carefully, it is difficult for legislators to know how much a good program might cost. One reason for the difficulty is the substantial cost variation that exists among states, and among regions within states, primarily because of differences in wages and space costs. One study found cost-of-living differences of 23 percent between the lowest-cost state (Arkansas) and the highest-cost state (Connecticut),[16] and within-state differentials are certainly as large if not larger. Rents in dense urban centers such as New York or San Francisco can inflate costs enormously, especially since physical space with access to outdoor play areas appropriate for children's programs is rare. For legislative purposes, national figures may be meaningless, and any state that is serious about expanding early

---

16. See Fournier and Rasmussen (1986). These results apply only to the 48 contiguous states. It must be emphasized that regional cost-of-living differences are not necessarily the same as regional variations in child-care costs, because some of the requirements of child care--especially physical space--are quite different from the expenditures of ordinary consumers.

childhood programs would do well to examine local cost conditions first.

Another reason for cost variation is obvious: the range of differences in the operating hours of different programs. Some early childhood programs that provide little more than parent-education operate only a couple of hours per week, for perhaps 6 to 8 months, for a total of 50 to 60 hours per child per year. Many preschool programs operate half-day programs, usually sessions of two and a half hours per day, for the 180-day school year, or 450 hours per year. In school settings, a full-day early childhood program usually operates the same hours as elementary grades, or about 6 hours per day during 180 days (about 1,080 hours per year). Of course, none of these operating periods is sufficient to cover the hours of working parents, who normally need care for about 9 hours per day for about 50 weeks--a total of about 2,250 hours per year. Moreover, many day-care centers are open from 7:00 or 8:00 A.M. until 6:00 P.M., a day which lasts 11 hours. Thus, a full-time child-care program provides about five times more hours of contact with a child than does the usual half-day preschool, and, if all other characteristics of the programs are the same, the costs per child are higher. In fact, the higher costs of full-time child care may have been a factor which led states to emphasize half-day preschool programs, despite the conventional rhetoric about the growing number of working women.

Still another reason that costs are difficult to calculate is the enormous variation in what programs include in their cost figures. Each program must of course pay for its teachers, and usually for its materials as well. But other necessary costs might not be charged to a program and thus will not appear in its cost estimates. For example, the administrative and cleaning expenses of programs that are run by school districts may come out of the elementary school budget, and such programs will not report any expenses for rent or utilities. Many child-care centers operate in churches and other quasi-public sites which require them to pay little or nothing for rent or utilities; in fact, one-quarter of all child-care facilities report paying <u>no</u> occupancy costs whatsoever. Furthermore, many programs and centers

rely on volunteer time, some as a matter of principle and others out of necessity.

Table 2 presents the average costs of a national sample of child-care facilities, with some effort to include donated resources. As shown by these figures, which are still underestimates, donated resources average about 14 percent of direct expenditures across all categories; other calculations indicate that, in some cases, donations equal about one-fifth of direct expenditures. Thus, the amounts involved are substantial.[17] With so many resources available free or at reduced cost, reported cost figures may seriously underestimate the true costs of operating early childhood programs, and the low expenditures that might be possible with a small church-based program or one in unused schoolrooms might be misleading.

The other services provided to children by programs also vary enormously. Some provide food, others require children to bring their own lunches; some provide transportation, others do not. Most exemplary early childhood programs provide some health screening, psychological testing, counseling, and other support services; a surprising proportion of child-care centers report providing some services, although almost no profit-making centers do.[18] From the viewpoint of "custodial" care, such services are ancillary, although they may be crucial to the success of self-consciously educational programs. Whatever their purpose, the various supplemental services

---

17. Cost figures are taken from Coelen et al. (1978), (available as ERIC document ED 160 188). This is the only study of child-care centers based on a national random sample rather than a local or a selected sample, and is thus the only source of reliable information on costs, despite its being ten years old.

18. The National Day Care Study reported that 64 percent provide hearing, speech, and vision examinations, 32 percent provide physical and dental examinations, 50 percent provide psychological testing, 86 percent provide counseling for children and 55 percent counseling for family problems, 32 percent provide transportation, and 45 percent provide information about food stamps and 52 percent information about community services. These supplemental services are more commonly available in nonprofit centers than in for-profit centers, and in federally supported programs than in those without federal revenue.

Table 2

COSTS BY PROGRAM TYPE

	Parent-Fee Centers		Federally Supported Centers		All Centers	
	Spending	Donations	Spending	Donations	Spending	Donations
Personnel	$1,448	$110	$2,809	$373	$2,260	$263
Occupancy	417	22	154	110*	351	66
Supplies	241	88	285	110	263	110
Other	66	0	219	0	154	0
Total	$2,172	$220	$3,467	$593	$3,028	$439

Spending refers to outlays; total resources used therefore equal the sum of spending and donations.

*Underestimate of imputed rents.

SOURCE: National Day Care Study, Vol. I, Table 7.4, p. 121. Monthly costs in March 1977 dollars are translated into annual costs in May 1986 dollars.

provided under different programs will make costs vary in ways that are difficult to detect.

The other major choices that affect the cost of early childhood programs involve, not surprisingly, personnel costs. For child-care programs, personnel costs average around 69 percent of total resources, although this proportion varies substantially;[19] decisions about personnel are thus crucial to overall cost calculations. Here, unfortunately, an inexorable tradeoff exists. For the costs of teachers only, it is obviously true that:

$$\frac{\text{cost}}{\text{child}} = \frac{\text{cost}}{\text{teacher}} \times \frac{\text{teachers}}{\text{child}}$$

For any government, and for parents with limited resources, concerns about costs imply keeping the costs per child low; however, concerns about quality imply that the cost per teacher--teachers' salaries and benefits--should be high in order to attract and retain competent teachers, and to maintain an adequate teacher to child ratio. The tradeoff between costs and quality is, with certain important exceptions, unavoidable.

To obtain some idea of how the cost components for teachers vary, one can examine figures from various child-care and preschool programs, as presented in Table 3. For comparative purposes, these figures from disparate sources and years are calculated in full-year salaries in 1986 dollars. Despite the uneven quality of the data, several patterns emerge. Child-care teachers are paid one-fourth to one-third more than child-care aides, although the distinction between teachers and aides

---

19. For example, profit-making centers (in which personnel are paid less) report that 62 percent of their expenditures are devoted to personnel, compared with 73 percent for nonprofit centers; federally supported centers spend 74 percent of their expenditures on personnel, while those centers that are supported entirely through parent fees spend only 61 percent on personnel. See Coelen et al. (1978).

Table 3

SALARIES FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD TEACHERS AND AIDES

Salaries in current dollars	Full-year salary, 1986 dollars
National Day Care Study (March 1977):	
Teachers $3.36/hour	$12,820
Aides $2.59/hour	9,882
NAEYC survey (March 1984):	
Teachers $5.67/hour	$12,456
Assistant teachers and aides $4.55/hour	9,979
Current Population Survey (March 1984):	
Child care workers $9204/year	$10,247
Pre-kindergarten and kindergarten teachers $15,648/year	17,422
1980 Census (1979 incomes):	
All child care workers $3,877/year	$6,308
Year-round full-time child care workers $6617/year 10,765	
Title XX programs (June 1981):	
Teachers $8,258/year	$11,680
Aides $7,259/year	$10,267
Perry Preschool (1964-65):	
Teachers $6,435/year	$25,542
California: all publicly-subsidized centers*	
Teachers $8.29/hour (spring 1986)	$16,580
Aides $6.24/hour	$12,480
California: school-based Children's Centers*	
Teachers $10.83/hour (spring 1986)	$21,660
Aides $7.45/hour	$14,990
West Los Angeles (1983):	
Teachers $5.47/hour	$12,822
Aides $4.39/hour	10,291
Santa Cruz (1983):	
Teachers $5.63/hour	$13,197
Aides $5.01/hour	11,744
Pasadena (1983):	
Teachers $5.15/hour	$12,072
Aides $3.84/hour	9,001
Northern Alameda County (July 1984):	
Teachers $6.79/hour	$14,658
Aides $4.80/hour	10,362

Table 3 (continued)
Salaries for Early Childhood Teachers and Aides

Los Angeles area (June 1986):	
Teachers $5.34/hour	$10,680
Aides $4.38/hour	8,760
Minnesota (Oct. 1984):	
Teachers $5.20/hour	$11,225
Aides $4.00/hour	8,635
Washtenaw Co., Michigan (1984):	
Teachers $6.35/hour	$14,140
Assistant teachers $4.57/hour	10,176
New York State, except New York City (1986)	
Head teachers $4.98/hour	$10,358
Aides $4.14/hour	$ 8,611
Public school teachers	
Average elementary teacher, 1983-84 $21,452	$24,482

*In addition, teachers receive benefits averaging 25 percent of salaries, while aides receive benefits averaging 22 percent. Other studies do not provide information on benefits.

SOURCES: see Appendix A.

is often ambiguous. The average annual pay for all child-care workers (teachers and aides) was roughly $11,000 per year in 1986 dollars--although the Census data indicate that roughly two-thirds of child-care workers worked less than full time and less than a full year, so that average earnings of all child-care workers are closer to $6,300. Even for full-time work, child-care teachers earn less than half of what elementary school teachers earn; average earnings of about $11,000 places the average teacher just at the poverty level of $10,990 for a family of four, meaning that a substantial proportion of child-care teachers are below the poverty level by this standard. Thus, there is much truth to the frequent complaints that child-care teachers are not paid enough.

Evidently, the salaries of child-care workers vary considerably; salary surveys often report differences of three to one between the highest and the lowest salaries for teachers and aides. In California, which offers the best data, salaries tend to be higher in programs that are operated by school districts, both because of the public funding available and because, in the past, efforts have been made to equalize the salaries of child-care teachers and elementary teachers. Across the country, federally subsidized centers pay more than centers that depend on fees from parents, and nonprofit centers pay more than profit-making centers. Of course, regional variation in salaries also exists, with dense, high-cost areas (such the San Francisco Bay Area) offering higher salaries.

COSTS AND INDICATORS OF QUALITY: THE TRADE-OFFS

The low salary levels in early childhood programs are generally considered to have dismal consequences. With wages that are not much above minimum wages, child-care programs across the country have reported high turnover rates and severe staff shortages.[20]

---

[20]. Many of the salary surveys reported in Table 3 were undertaken as a way to document salary levels and turnover, once providers in an area decided that working conditions had reached a crisis level. See Whitebook (1986); Whitebook, Howes, Darrah, and Friedman (1981); and other materials from the Child Care Employee Project, Oakland.

Particularly in caring for young children, for whom continuity is important in order to maintain their trust and affection, turnover itself can harm the quality of programs. Moreover, salaries may be inadequate even at the elementary-school level. Currently, many commentators are forecasting impending shortages of teachers (exacerbated by relatively low salaries), and several groups--including the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy in a well-publicized report (1986)--have called for increases in teachers' salaries. While it is unclear how much salary increases will reduce turnover among and enhance the quality of early childhood teachers, there is little doubt that a tradeoff exists between cost and quality.

Just as salaries vary substantially, so do adult/child ratios. (The adults in these ratios can include different combinations of teachers and aides, but they should not include administrators, janitors, cooks, and other nonclassroom personnel.) As summarized in Table 4, exemplary programs tend to exhibit high ratios--the Perry Preschool project with 1:6, Head Start with 1:7.5, and the California Children's Centers with 1:8. The Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, applicable to federally funded child care before 1980, required 1:7 for four-year-olds; in practice, federally subsidized centers averaged 1:6 (for all age groups) in the late 1970s, with privately supported child-care averaging 1:7.3. In most states, licensing standards for four-year-olds vary between 1:10 and 1:20. As indicated in Table 1, the preschool programs that have recently been legislated in many states generally require a ratio of 1:10, although New Jersey permits 1:25 (the same as the kindergarten ratio), and Texas allows 1:22. The Texas ratio is a new legislative target for kindergarten through third-grade classrooms, and illustrates that applying elementary school standards to early childhood programs can create ratios that are much too low.

The National Day Care Study, initiated in part to examine federal standards, found that ratios between 1:5 and 1:10 had little effect on

Table 4

ADULT-CHILD RATIOS IN DIFFERENT PROGRAMS

Preschools: (see also Table 1)	
Perry Preschool	1:6
Head Start	1:7.5
California pre schools	1:8
Child care:	
National Day Care Study:	
average, all centers	1:6.5
average, parent fee centers	1:7.3
average, federally-aided centers	1:6.0
California Children's Centers	1:8
State licensing standards (for 4-year-olds)	1:7 to 1:20
Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements (age 3-6)	1:7
National Day Care Study recommendations	1:8 to 1:10
NAEYC recommendations	1:10 or less

the quality of programs, and recommended ratios between 1:8 and 1:10 based on enrollments (so that, with normal absences, the usual ratios based on attendance would be 1:7 to 1:9). Above the 1:10 level, however, the study found that quality deteriorates, and in particular that children show less persistence and less interest and participation in activities. Consistent with these recommendations, the National Association for the Education of Young Children (1986a) recommended a ratio of no more than 1:10 for 4- and 5-year-olds, with gradual increases in this ratio as children move into the primary grades.

Obviously, these figures indicate the wide variety of ratios in existing early childhood programs, although no systematic differences appear to exist between half-day preschool programs and full-day child-care programs. Despite the diversity in practice, some consensus has emerged about acceptable ratios; a standard of 1:10 is the outer limit of recommendations and has appeared in many of the recently legislated preschool programs. However, some important dissent from this consensus still exists, especially from the private proprietary sector, which generally supports more children per adult in the interests of higher profits, and from conservative legislators who are trying to serve the greatest number of children for the least amount of money--the model of "custodial" care. Obviously enough, ratios have a great effect on the costs of early childhood programs; a ratio of 1:6, as in the Perry Preschool, will entail almost four times more for teacher costs than will the 1:22 ratio in the Texas prekindergartens, as long as salaries are equivalent. Furthermore, it is reasonably clear that the class sizes even of kindergarten classrooms--which average about 23 children per teacher (see Educational Research Service, 1986)--are outside the range of acceptable ratios for early childhood programs, particularly those which are considered exemplary.

Unfortunately, then, for both salaries and adult-child ratios, the tradeoffs between costs and quality are serious. However, two aspects of quality do not entail higher expenditures. First, as found in the National Day Care Study, smaller class sizes enhance quality regardless of the adult-child ratio, because smaller groups reduce distractions and chaos and increase the interaction between teachers and children; thus, two classes of 20 are better than one class of 40 children, even

with the same number of teachers. Second, the teacher-training component that matters most is specific preparation in early childhood development, not formal years of schooling in general, implying that teachers need not hold B.A. degrees. According to this evidence, a teacher with a community college certificate in early childhood or with a Child Development Associate credential would be preferable to someone with a B.A.-level elementary teaching certificate but without training in early childhood education.

POTENTIAL AND COMPARATIVE PROGRAM COSTS

Given the variation in what teachers are paid, in adult-child ratios, in access to free or reduced-cost facilities, in volunteer resources, in the geographic costs of living, and in the ancillary services that are provided by programs, it is almost foolish to venture what a "typical" early childhood program might cost. Still, a few available figures provide some guidance about the general magnitudes. In these figures, arrayed in Table 5, it is important that half-day preschool programs be distinguished from full-day child-care programs, since their operating hours differ so widely. As always, the programs that are considered exemplary--the Perry Preschool program, with its high teacher salaries, high ratios, and many ancillary services, and the California Children's Centers, with their explicitly educational focus, higher salaries, and larger service network than is available in most child-care programs--cost much more than other, presumably "average" programs. (The Perry Preschool, in particular, is much more expensive than any other program, except the most expensive of the California Children's Centers.) As programs draw closer to the public schools, they tend to become more expensive, because salaries tend to be higher and perhaps because other instructional costs--especially curriculum materials--are higher. Of course, urban-rural differences exist, and programs in high-cost cities are particularly expensive

Table 5

PER PUPIL COSTS OF PRESCHOOL AND CHILD CARE PROGRAMS

	Annual cost, 1986 dollars
Preschools:	
Perry Preschool: $4,818 (1981 dollars)	$6,187
Head Start: $2,808 (1984) (including a 20 percent local match)	$3,047
California Preschools: $10.37/day, 1985-86	$1,883
Child care:	
National Day Care Study (March 1977)	
Total resources:	
All centers $158/month	$3,467
Publicly-funded centers $185/month	$4,060
Parent-fee centers $109/month	$2,392
Expenditures (excluding donations):	
All centers $138/month	$3,028
Publicly-funded centers $158/month	$3,467
Parent-fee centers $99/month	$2,172
California Children's Centers: $18.56/day, 1985-86	$4,681
California Alternate Payment Programs: $15.90/day	$4,010
Publicly-Subsidized Child Care in California (1984-85)	
All programs $17.94/day	$4,525
Lowest-cost program $8.36/day	$2,108
Highest-cost program $24.59/day	$6,202
Public schools, K-12	
$2,948/pupil (1982-83)	$3,431

SOURCES: See Appendix A.

because of higher rents and salaries.[21] Finally, a difference does seem to exist between the costs of child care, which averages around $3,000 per year, and the costs of half-day preschool programs, which appear to cost closer to $2,000 (excluding exemplary programs). But these comparisons are potentially misleading, because preschool programs both are open for far fewer hours and often report marginal costs for teachers and materials without considering the costs of physical space and administration. Exemplary preschool programs with more complete cost-accounting mechanisms, such as Head Start, cost as much as most child care; shorter hours of operation are offset by higher salaries to teachers and a tendency to pay teachers for a full day even when they are with children only for a half day.

As a benchmark, the average expenditure per child in public schools was $2,948 in 1983-84, the equivalent in 1986 dollars of $3,431. This figure is considerably higher than the costs of most preschools (always with the exception of the Perry Preschool), higher than the average $3,000 cost for all child care, about the same as the $3,467 cost of federally subsidized child care, and less than the cost of the exemplary Children's Centers. Of course, rough similarities between the overall costs of schools and child-care programs mask substantial differences; elementary school salaries are much higher than salaries in child care and preschool programs, but their adult/child ratios are much lower. Again, this difference implies that if ratios in early childhood programs are maintained at an appropriate range around 1:10, and if early childhood programs are incorporated into the schools (where salaries are likely to increase because of comparisons with elementary teachers), then the costs of early childhood education programs are likely to rise above the current average cost of children in elementary-secondary education.

One final, obvious implication of the figures in Tables 3, 4, and 5 is worth pointing out. The greatest excitement in this country about early childhood education has been generated by the Perry Preschool

---

21. The California Legislative Analyst found a 4 percent difference between the costs of urban and rural programs, though this difference was statistically insignificant. However, this unexpected result may be due to the efforts to narrow the range of expenditures among child care facilities (California Legislative Analyst, 1985).

program and its claims of 7:1 benefit-cost ratio. But, among all early childhood programs, the Perry Preschool consistently exhibits the highest adult-child ratios, the highest salaries, and the highest costs, an extraordinarily expensive program by any standard. While the news about its benefits has been widely circulated, an understanding of its costs and quality has lagged--indeed, it is implausible to believe that in the current economic atmosphere, any state would spend as much as $6,187 per child for child care. To be sure, the evaluations of Head Start, a much cheaper program, have also been positive, and many other programs with positive outcomes are much less intensive than the Perry Preschool. Still, the benefits of exemplary programs cannot be expected for ostensibly similar programs of low quality: it is senseless to cite evidence from exemplary, high-quality programs and then to enact a program with low spending, low ratios, low salaries, and inadequate teacher preparation. Some of the programs recently adopted by the states--such as the Texas prekindergarten, with its 1:22 ratio, and perhaps some of the programs allowed in New Jersey--stand little chance of providing much benefit to children; some of these are likely to be purely custodial, and some of them may be detrimental.

The possibility of inadvertently enacting low-quality programs illustrates the importance of making explicit decisions about the structure of early childhood programs--decisions about ratios, salaries, the training of early childhood teachers, and the provision of ancillary services. Even though data on costs are poor, it is still possible to construct representative budgets to determine rough orders of magnitude and to consider more explicitly the tradeoffs among the components of early childhood programs. Table 6 presents some possible ways to calculate annual per-child costs based on different combinations of ratios, salaries, and ancillary services, which have been derived from data in the earlier tables. The effects of increasing teacher-child ratios and increasing teacher salaries on costs are obvious from these figures; increasing ratios above 1:10 is especially expensive. It is possible to specify conditions that lead to annual costs of about $2,000 per child for child care. A preschool program which pays only marginal salaries to teachers (and which has a 1:10 adult-child ratio and pays a teacher more than child-care workers

but less than elementary teachers) might cost about $1,860 per year--just about what the California preschools report. However, with more generous allowances for nonteaching costs (assuming fewer donations) and with more reasonable salaries, costs per child increase to a range of $2,700 to $3,500--quite close to the averages reported in Table 5. Such calculations can at least provide some guidance about the orders of magnitude involved--and they can help identify those programs whose quality is suspect or whose costs seem excessive.

Of course, the issue of appropriate costs can never be fully resolved. With respect to the public schools, the notion of an "adequate" or "appropriate" level of spending has proved to be a chimera, and myriad factors--wealth and income, the educational level and mobility of the citizenry, the age structure of the population, the structure of taxation, and comparisons among neighboring states and districts--have influenced expenditure levels. In California--the only state with a well-developed early childhood policy--appropriate spending levels have been a constant concern; the political battles have included attempts to search for low-cost alternatives to expensive school-based programs, efforts to narrow spending differences across the state, arguments over the salaries of child-care teachers versus elementary teachers, disagreements about appropriate cost-of-living adjustments, and inequities among different types of early childhood programs--all issues familiar in K-12 education. Analyzing costs carefully cannot eliminate these political wrangles or make the difficult tradeoffs any easier, but they can clarify the available choices and the likely consequences of legislative decisions.

Table 6

OPTIONS AND ALTERNATIVE COSTS

Ratios:

RA 1:20	RC: 1:10
RB 1:15	RD: 1:6

Teacher salaries:

- SA: $7,300 (minimum wage)
- SB: $12,800 (current average childcare teacher)
- SC: $18,600 (average of childcare and elementary teachers)
- SC: $24,500 (average elementary school teacher)

Other personnel costs

- AA: none; paid by school district
- AB: $373
- AC: $746 (non-personnel costs of publicly-funded centers, National Day Care Study)

Space costs:

- SpA: none; paid by school district or church
- SpB: $200/year, rest donated
- SpC: $417/year

Materials:

- MA: none; borrowed from school district or donated
- MB: $130
- MC: $263

Other:

- OA: None
- OB: $100
- OC: $219

Annual costs per child under alternative assumptions:

		Salaries SB	SC	SD	
Ratios	1:20	$1,443	1,733	2,028	Other costs: AB, SpB, MB, OB
	1:15	1,656	2,043	2,436	
	1:10	2,083	2,663	3,253	
	1:6	2,936	3,903	4,886	

NOTE:

Low-moderate costs (with substantial donations): (RC,SB,AB,SpB,MB,OB)	$2,083
Low-moderate cost with teacher salaries increased to SC:	$2,667
High/moderate costs (without substantial donations): (RC,SB,AC,SpC,MC,OC)	$2,925
High/moderate costs with teacher salaries increased to SC:	$3,505
High cost: (RD,SD,AC,SpC,MC,OC)	$5,728

V. THE CHOICES STATES FACE: POLICY OPTIONS IN EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS

In developing an early childhood policy, most states have a rare opportunity. Although states must clearly contend with existing interest groups, most have established almost no early childhood policy and can thus start with a nearly blank slate. The ability to create policy virtually de novo presents an opportunity to examine the entire range of options and to select those alternatives that best fit the disparate needs of children and working parents. It is probably easier to establish policies on the basis of sound principles at the outset; once enacted, poor practices may develop constituencies and become more difficult to change.

TARGETING OPTIONS

Obviously, the states face one critical choice: which children should be served, and in what types of programs? Most of the programs that have recently been enacted by states are half-day preschool programs for at-risk 4-year-olds, but each decision underlying the structure of the program--the age range of the children to be served, whether all children or only specific target groups should be included, and whether part-day or full-day programs would be available--involved a greater array of options. (Table 7 presents a detailed outline of the options and choices that are faced by the states.[22]) In particular, given the continued division between child care and preschool programs in the face of the growing recognition that many parents need full-day care for their children, the decision to offer a half-day or a full-day program--or to institute a morning preschool program with an after-school program, to cover the working day--is crucial.

---

22. For a similar and somewhat more detailed presentation of the options, see Schweinhart and Koshel (1986).

Table 7

POLICY CHOICES

1. Who shall be served?

   Age groups: 4-year-olds
   3 to 4-year-olds
   toddlers and infants ages 0-2

   Target groups: Low-income children
   Educationally "at-risk" children
   Limited English-speaking children
   All children

2. Program duration/hours of operation

   Morning or half-day preschool (2-3 hours)
   Full school day (5-6 hours)
   Full working-day (8-10 hours)
   Morning pre-school plus after-school program

3. Funding level, services provided, and funding sources

   Level -- Spending per child ranges between $1,000 and $6,000
   Capital outlay funds
   Services provided: Basic care/instruction only
   Transportation
   Health screening
   Health care
   Psychological screening
   Counseling
   Parent education
   Social services/information to parents
   Revenue sources: State revenues only
   State revenues plus required local revenues
   State revenues plus parent fees

4. Funding mechanisms

   Expand existing programs
   Expand state tax credits
   Project funding via proposals:
   school districts only eligible
   school districts eligible, with subcontracts allowed
   districts and community-based organizations eligible
   Formula funding to school districts:
   existing school aid formula
   new aid formula specifically for early childhood
   Formula funding to districts, towns, cities, or counties

Table 7 (continued)
Policy Choices

Voucher mechanisms:
- vouchers to parents, unrestricted
- vouchers to parents, restricted to programs of specified quality
- vouchers administered by programs (vendor payments)

California model: various funding mechanisms for different programs

5. State administrative agency

- State department of education (perhaps with a new office of early childhood education)
- State department of education, with an interagency coordinating council
- State welfare agency
- State agency that licenses child care, or that currently administers Head Start
- State office for children
- New state agency

6. Quality control

- Adult/child ratios
- Teacher and aide salary levels
- Teacher certification and preparation
- Licensing requirements
- Technical assistance

7. Teacher certification and preparation

- Early childhood training required
- Elementary teaching credential acceptable or required
- Sub-B.A. credentials (certificates, A.A. degrees, and CDA) acceptable or required
- B.A. required

FUNDING OPTIONS

Decisions about funding are similarly important. Choices about the eligibility of children and the range of operating hours will of course affect costs. Decisions about funding levels may also affect quality, particularly through their influence on adult-child ratios and wage levels. Under some circumstances, funds for capital outlays--primarily to build facilities appropriate for young children--may be necessary, particularly in areas which are experiencing rapid population growth; for example, many districts in Texas have been forced to postpone their prekindergarten program because of the lack of classrooms (Grubb et al. 1985, Ch. 8). Finally, some decisions must be made about which (if any) ancillary services--including transportation, health screening, health care, psychological screening, counseling, and other social services--are to be publicly funded along with basic care and instruction. The Head Start model--the other early childhood program aside from the Perry Preschool that has captured the public's imagination--has always included a wide array of ancillary services, although some state legislatures may be reluctant to fund them.

Another fiscal decision involves the division of total costs. One way to stretch state funds is to require local revenues to support some fraction of total costs; but if this fraction is too high, then few cities and school districts (or only wealthy districts) will want to participate, and most community-based organizations will be unable to participate.[23] Another alternative would be to require parents to contribute to programs, especially through a sliding fee schedule based upon income that provides greater subsidies to the poorest children. In this case, the design of the fee schedule may be crucial to the participation of families with different incomes.

---

23. However, community-based organizations can provide a local match through in-kind resources--such as rent-free space, volunteer time, contributions of administrative time, and the like.

OPTIONS FOR PROGRAM STRUCTURES

Early childhood programs can be structured in many ways. The simplest option available to states would be to expand existing programs--either child-care programs funded through Title XX/SSBG funds or Head Start programs. This alternative would add state revenues to existing (and dwindling) federal funds for these programs, allowing more low-income children to be served; state revenues could also be used to allow more moderate-income children to join existing programs--for example, by using a sliding fee schedule that, again, permits parents to pay a fee based on their income. In the past several years, a few states have "bought out" their Title XX/SSBG child-care programs, replacing federal funds with state funds and freeing federal funds to be used for other social services; and several states, including Massachusetts, Maine, and Rhode Island, have expanded Head Start with their own revenues. The simplicity of this alternative is obviously an advantage, since it would not be necessary to develop new administrative structures or new program models. However, such an approach would do nothing to integrate the "educational" and the "custodial" strands of early childhood programs, or to improve the quality of existing child care.

Another simple alternative would be to expand state tax credits. Currently, 25 states offer a credit or deduction for child care in their personal income tax system, and all but four of these states tie this deduction to the federal tax credit. The amount of money implied in the credits of most states is not large, thus providing little help to parents--although in most states these tax subsidies are still larger than direct subsidies.[24] Therefore, an obvious step would be to expand a state's credit, and, moreover, make it refundable in order to extend the benefit to low-income parents, who do not pay taxes and thus do not benefit from credits or deductions.

An alternative would be to provide credits to corporations rather than to individuals. For example, Connecticut had a credit equal to 25 percent of expenses incurred by corporations in planning, acquiring, or

---

[24] On state tax credits and deductions, see Child Care: Whose Priority?, pp. 230-240.

renovating (but not operating) day-care facilities, although no corporations took advantage of it. In an effort to increase participation, this credit was recently replaced with a credit equal to 50 percent of the amount invested--but with a limit of $250,000 per year for the entire state, so that total support will be trivial. The strategy of tax credits to corporations is a novel one, and builds on recent interest in encouraging corporations to provide child care as an employee benefit similar to health-care benefits. However, the effectiveness of corporate credits is unclear: they would not necessarily encourage high-quality programs, and they may be used only by the largest, richest, and most socially conscious corporations--leaving behind most low-income parents with marginal employment whose need for the subsidy is the most desperate.

The strategy of increasing tax credits is always politically attractive, since it is easier to enact them than it is direct spending programs. However, several drawbacks to tax-based subsidies exist, and at the federal level recent tax legislation has moved to eliminate such tax provisions. First, low-income parents tend not to benefit from tax subsidies; furthermore, benefits come in the year after child-care expenses are incurred. Second, it is impossible to monitor the quality of care under tax credits; particularly if a state's intent is to establish compensatory preschool programs of high quality, tax subsidies would be inappropriate. Finally, tax subsidies are poor instruments of policy because the amounts involved are often unclear. Given these drawbacks, one alternative would be for states to repeal their child-care tax subsidies and use this revenue to fund early childhood programs directly.

The most serious problem with expanding existing state programs is that this approach would do nothing to reconcile the "educational" and the "custodial" division of early childhood programs, or to bring the educational system and the early childhood community closer together. States have available to them numerous mechanisms which could help realize the richest possibilities of early childhood programs, rather than simply forcing them to follow the models which happen to be in place. Many of the recent state initiatives that have established pilot projects have used project grants--that is, applications by local

organizations for state funds based on specific proposals. In the recent state initiatives, only school districts are eligible to apply, but project grants can also be extended to community-based organizations. Project grants are appropriate for pilot projects, and they give the state maximum control over the content of programs. They are also good mechanisms for states to test experimental programs--or, ideally, several different program models--and then to consider expansion based on evidence of success or failure. However, project grants are less appropriate for general programs that intend to provide early childhood programs statewide, and they may give an advantage to organizations--such as wealthy school districts--which have sophisticated mechanisms for writing grant proposals.

Some states, including New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maine, have used their existing school-aid formulas to direct funds for preschool programs to districts. That is, children in such programs are included in average daily attendance counts, which determine the state's aid. This approach has the obvious advantage of building on familiar funding mechanisms, rather than requiring the political and technical decisions necessary for a new aid formula. However, it does restrict funds only to school districts. Typically, very few districts have taken advantage of such potential revenues; in most states, state aid funds only a fraction of total costs in K-12 programs, and districts may be reluctant to fund novel or experimental programs out of local revenues. In addition, the well-known problem of inequalities between rich and poor districts, the subject of numerous court cases, would be replicated if existing funding formulas were extended to early childhood programs. A likely consequence would be that only wealthy districts that are aggressively committed to early childhood and to experimentation would receive state funds under this mechanism--and these are unlikely to include the districts which contain the children most in need of preschool programs. Nor is there any evidence that the benefits demonstrated by the Perry Preschool and other compensatory efforts would materialize for the middle-class children in such districts.

An obvious alternative would be to devise a distinctive funding formula for early childhood programs--one that initially provides a

higher level of support, and perhaps a greater inducement for poor districts to participate, than do existing state-aid formulas.[25] Texas took this approach in funding its prekindergarten program, for example, providing a matching grant (different from the regular K-12 formula) where the state's share is higher for poorer districts. If carefully designed, such a mechanism could eliminate the problems associated with using existing formulas--with the exception that, again, only school districts would be eligible, and the chance to support a variety of programs lost.

To circumvent this problem, yet another alternative would be to create a funding mechanism for which either school districts or community-based organizations could apply. This mechanism could entail either establishing a system of competitive grants for which school districts, cities, and towns, and community-based organizations could apply, or devising a formula which directs state aid to cities and towns (as well as school districts) under the presumption that cities and towns would subcontract with community-based organizations for the provision of early childhood programs.[26] These grants could then be used either to support programs of specified types--for example, half-day preschool programs, or full-day child-care programs with certain educational requirements--or programs unique to localities, subject to broad requirements that the funds be used to serve young children.

In some areas--especially rural areas--the school system might be the only organization to apply for such grants; but in most cities several different types of organizations--existing child-care programs, church-based groups and social service agencies, neighborhood groups and minority advocacy organizations, and lab schools based in colleges-

---

[25] Devising a new formula also allows a state to devise a different unit for reimbursement. Currently, most states provide aid per student in average daily attendance; but this is an inappropriate unit to use in early childhood programs, where children may attend for different hours and different periods throughout the year. Alternatives include reimbursement per hour or per day, differentiated by type of program.

[26] Of course, in some states school districts are not independent of towns and cities; in this case some division of funds between schools and non-school organizations could either be imposed by the state legislature or left to local discretion.

-can be expected to apply along with the schools. Allowing a variety of organizations to apply for and receive funds would provide some competition with the schools, and would generate a more diverse set of programs. Furthermore, if school and nonschool programs can interact meaningfully, it would provide another vehicle for drawing together the different communities which have an interest in young children; schools can learn from organizations whose concerns and goals are different, and community-based organizations can absorb the educational techniques of the schools. Obviously, allowing nonschool organizations to receive state funds creates problems that do not arise if school districts are the only recipients.[27] However, many of these problems are familiar to states from funding other social services, and the advantages of diversity should outweigh any administrative difficulties.

PROVIDING FUNDS TO PARENTS

The funding alternatives outlined thus far direct revenues to programs. Conversely, "vouchers" are rather different mechanisms that direct funds to parents, to spend in programs of their choosing. Vouchers for early childhood programs would have the same advantages that have been claimed for education vouchers--facilitating parental choice and supporting the large private sector that now exists--with fewer of their disadvantages. In particular, given the current racial and class segregation in programs for young children that has been caused by federal subsidies directed only to the poor, vouchers would probably help integrate rather than further segregate these programs. Vouchers could be unrestricted, or they could be restricted so that parents could use them only for programs that meet specified quality

---

[27] For example, state agencies must become skilled at determining the quality of programs, in order to avoid funding community-based organization of poor quality. Hard decisions also have to be made about whether to fund profit-making as well as non-profit agencies, and about funding church-based groups. If a state is serious about fostering variety, it may be necessary to provide considerable technical assistance to encourage community groups to develop programs. California goes so far as to provide some funds for capital outlays and start-up costs for new programs, since community-based organizations often have cash-flow problems that make it difficult to develop programs.

standards. This approach would again help promote diversity and flexibility, without sacrificing state control over the content of early childhood programs (including the capacity for compensatory education).

MULTIPROGRAM FUNDING

Still another approach would be to enact different legislation for the various types of early childhood programs, along with mechanisms to integrate them. For example, most of the recent state initiatives in early childhood education fund half-day preschool programs, leaving the day-care problem--caring for children during the remainder of the working day--unresolved. One alternative, then, would be to establish parallel programs that support both half-day preschool programs in school districts and after-school programs, run either by districts or by community-based organizations. Such an approach would make it possible for more children--especially low-income children whose mothers work--to attend preschool programs. However, it would also perpetuate the idea that "educational" programs and "custodial" child care are distinct, and would create coordination and logistical problems between the preschool and the after-school components.

The logical extension of a system of multiple funding for different types of early childhood programs is the California model. California now supports a wide variety of programs: school-based child-care programs (the Children's Centers); community-based child care (the heirs of the old Title XX program); a half-day preschool program; separate programs for migrant children, children of college students, and teenage mothers in high school; a voucher program that allows parents to select one of a range of child-care facilities; a school-age child-care program; and mechanisms for funding family day care, information and referral services, capital-outlay needs, and start-up activities. This complex system enables eligible parents with different needs to choose among a range of relevant programs. The existence of this diverse set of programs provides the state with an array of information on parental requirements, variations in costs and administrative practices, and the specific service and operational problems experienced by different types of organizations. Not surprisingly, coordinating these diverse programs is difficult; the

quality of programs is a constant concern (as it is in every area of social policy), and the costs of this system are relatively high. Still, the California model provides a vision of early childhood programs in which flexibility and variety are enhanced without the chaos and poor quality that are now so prevalent in programs for young children.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPTIONS

A more subtle decision entails choosing the state agency that should administer early childhood programs. The dominant outlook for an agency and the backgrounds of its personnel may partially determine the content of its programs; thus, identifying the administrative agency is crucial to the regulations and other small decisions that shape programs. Currently, most federally funded child care is administered through welfare agencies, while the preschool programs that have recently been enacted have been placed in state departments of education (with one exception) to emphasize their educational orientation. Neither alternative is completely satisfactory. Welfare agencies have an unavoidable stigma attached to them, and their objective is to move families off welfare and concentrate on abused and neglected children, rather than focusing on "normal" children and educational goals. For their part, education agencies are unfamiliar with early childhood programs and are often unsympathetic to child-care concerns.

To avoid these problems, states have sometimes considered administering early childhood programs in an independent state agency, such as an Office for Children; Washington decided to administer its new preschool programs through the Department of Community Affairs (which is also responsible for Head Start), partly in the belief that the education department would be unsympathetic to programs for young children. Another approach is that of South Carolina, which has adopted a model of interagency coordination. Although its department of education is responsible for operating the preschool program, an interagency coordinating council must approve all plans for the program; its members come from all state agencies which serve children,

including the welfare agency. Although many coordinating councils in social programs have poor records, the South Carolina effort is considered successful because of its longevity and the strong support of its governor.

Given the current divisions over early childhood programs, developing a new and probably weak agency does not necessarily represent an adequate resolution of the administrative decision.[28] An alternative would be to grant administrative responsibility to an existing agency, such as the state's education agency, but then to provide the staff and the networks necessary both to ensure that the program adheres to model early childhood practices and bridges the different worlds of early childhood. One mechanism for doing so would be an advisory group which includes educators, early childhood advocates, welfare officials, and representatives of other camps. Several states--including California and Connecticut--have had considerable success with such groups, and have found that they can help create consensus out of confusion.

ENSURING HIGH QUALITY

Once funding and administrative choices are made, states must still ensure that the programs are of good quality. Obviously, many of the choices about quality are made in legislative prescriptions about operating hours, adult/child ratios, teachers' salaries (which may

---

[28] The idea of creating a new state agency is linked to an old ideal among early childhood educators--that they could create an institutional alternative to the schooling system, strong enough to exist independently and indeed able by force of its example to transform the schools. The history of the kindergarten movement does not provide any reassurance that this can be done, and the other attempts to build institutional alternatives have similarly failed. The 4c's movement of the 1960s has collapsed, as have most community action agencies; state agencies for children have typically served to coordinate existing programs, not to administer large-scale programs. The idea of creating a new institution de novo specifically for early childhood programs might be attractive, but--aside from being politically unrealistic--it would exacerbate coordination problems with the schools. Faute de mieux, I conclude that in most states building on the existing school systems--while working to make sure the schools adhere to good practice in early childhood programs--is the only feasible alternative.

affect the calibre of teachers and turnover rates), the costs per child, and other aspects of program structure. The decision to fund a half-day preschool, as many states have done recently, is simultaneously a decision not to expand care that is appropriate for working parents; a spending limit of $1,000 per child, or an adult/child ratio of 1:22, is implicitly a decision not to require programs of high quality.

Still another mechanism for guiding the content of early childhood programs is teacher certification, specifying the educational requirements for those who work in child development agencies. In this area, the early childhood community and the research on quality of care have reached one unanimous recommendation: teachers of young children must have specific training in early childhood development. Such a requirement--without waivers for teachers with elementary teaching certificates--is one way to prevent elementary teachers from being placed in such programs without retraining (as was proposed in the 1970s), and to ensure that programs are not simply downward extensions of kindergarten. A more controversial certification issue emerges from the National Day Care Study, which found that the quality of care is a function of specific training in early childhood, not of the number of years of education. One implication is that early childhood programs need not be staffed with college graduates, and that individuals with community college certificates and degrees, or with Child Development Associate (CDA) credentials, are appropriate teachers. One common scenario for state certification might be, for example, a classroom with one teacher and one aide, who can be distinguished by their experience and the extent of their early childhood training, but not necessarily by their years of formal schooling.

Finally, program quality can be enhanced by the actions of the state administering agency, through licensing requirements and technical assistance. All states license child-care facilities, although licensing is usually interpreted as ensuring that minimum health and safety standards are met, rather than as enhancing the quality of the programs. Technical assistance--providing consultation, workshops, information about model programs, and access to a network of early childhood practitioners who are concerned about quality--is a

better way to encourage the development of good programs. To be sure, the provision of technical assistance requires a competent state agency, or some parallel institution with legitimacy; in California, for example, a good deal of technical assistance is provided by state-supported resource and referral agencies, as well as by the state agency.

There is no dearth of policy options available to state early childhood programs. Rather, the problem is to decide on a state's goals and then to devise the mechanisms that will best accomplish them. Inevitably, such goals will be partially contradictory. Tradeoffs are inevitable--between costs and quality, between diversity and standardization, between high levels of state funding to promote local participation and lower levels that are politically feasible, between those who support only "educational" programs and those who promote child care, and between educators and the early childhood community. But these tradeoffs are all familiar problems to states, even if they crop up in an unfamiliar area; as long as the underlying issues are fully aired, the mechanisms for achieving good compromises can be developed.

VI. HOPES FOR CHILDREN

The current "movement" for early childhood programs is still ill defined. The programs enacted thus far have been small and tentative, and some of them seem to have been legislative accidents without much public support. In many states, the constituencies that would normally support early childhood programs--children's advocates, women's groups, educators who are concerned about preschool preparation, and early childhood advocates--have not yet organized themselves behind such programs, and of course the parents of young children do not form a coherent political group. The idea of extending schooling downward is indeed an old one, now buttressed by better evidence about the long-terms effects of preschool programs; and because the reality of child care is with us, the notion of young children outside their homes, in formal institutions, is no longer strange. If there is anything novel about the current period, it is simply that the motives for early childhood programs have intensified.

Still, a conventional barrier to governmental funding of early childhood programs remains: the basic uncertainty about whether government should extend its support to young children, or whether parents should remain responsible. One response, of course, is that government is already involved. The subsidies to early childhood programs through Head Start, through the welfare system, through tax credits at both the federal and state levels, and through a variety of smaller, less visible programs are larger than most citizens recognize; but they are also uncoordinated, poorly planned, and often ineffective. Another response is the counsel of prevention; that is, failing to spend money on adequate programs for young children will generate costs for government later, in remedial education programs, in the justice system, and in lost opportunities that can be prevented for less money. Ben Franklin's adage about an ounce of prevention remains popular, even if governments often seem less willing to fund prevention than remediation.

A more straightforward response is simply that times have changed. The old model of the self-sufficient family, in which parents (and especially mothers) reared their children without outside help, has

been coming apart ever since the family farm and family-based craft work began to disappear in the eighteenth century. The rise of maternal employment in the past few decades has merely continued a trend that has been underway for a much longer period of time. Family practices and child-rearing patterns have changed; the issue now is whether or not citizens and their governments will fully recognize and support these changes. As an example, the funding of the public schools 150 years ago recognized that parents could no longer educate their children, as they had earlier on the family farm and in apprenticeship system. The time may have come to extend this sharing of responsibilities to children of earlier ages.

If we take John Dewey's precept seriously--"What the best and wisest parent wants for his own child, that must the community want for all its children"--then it is relatively clear what must be done. Increasingly, parents need arrangements for children during working hours. They worry about the quality and the affordability of care, and, while they disagree about the importance of cognitive and noncognitive goals in programs for young children, few of them would subordinate one to the other. Parents--all parents--have high aspirations for their young children; they want them to experience success and to develop confidence outside their homes, to grow up competent and healthy, to obtain a good education, and not to be kept from the mainstream of American life because of poor schooling. To be sure, parents often do not know how to go about realizing these high ideals for their children, especially if they are battered by the pressures of daily life, the strictures of poverty, or the daily stigma of lower-class status; they may retreat in confusion or defer to professionals.

Still, it is not difficult to see what is good for young children. The accumulated experiences of early childhood programs, the research on the effects and quality of programs, the broad areas of consensus among parents and those professionals who have thought the hardest about young children--all provide the materials for knitting together the divisions in the arena of early childhood programs. Only then will it be possible to make good on our rhetoric about children as "our most

precious natural resource," rather than leaving that rhetoric as evidence of broken promises.

APPENDIX A:

Data Sources

In Tables 2-5, dollar figures are updated to May 1986 dollars by using the implicit price deflator for state and local compensation for all salary figures, and the implicit price deflator for state and local government purchases for total childcare costs.

Table 3: National Day Care Study figures come from Craig Coelen et al., Day Care Centers in the U.S.: A National Profile 1976-77. Vol. III, Final Report of the National Day Care Study, Abt Associates, December 1978; the figures are based on a national probability sample of daycare centers. The NAEYC salary survey was published in Young Children, November 1984, p. 14; the survey reports responses to a questionnaire and is probably severely biased, and it is surprising that the averages are close to the NDCS averages. Current Population Survey figures, as yet unpublished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, are reported in the NAEYC's "In Whose Hands? A Demographic Fact Sheet on Child Care Providers." Census figures come from the U.S. Census, Earnings by Occupation and Industry, Table 1, p. 139; these are figures for childcare workers, with the exception of private household workers. The Title XX salaries were reported in Day Care and Child Development Reports, February 1, 1982. The salaries for the Perry Preschool are taken from W. Steven Barnett, The Perry Preschool and Its Long-Term Effects: A Benefit-Cost Analysis, High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Series, No. 2, 1985. Figures for California's publicly subsidized child care come from The Cost of State-Subsidized Child Care in California, MPR Associates, Berkeley, September 1986. The various salaries from California, Minnesota, and Michigan were taken from leaflets available from the Child Care Employment Project, Oakland; all use methods intended to survey a random sample of childcare workers. New York State figures come from Caroline Zinsser, Day Care's Unfair Burden: How Low Wages Subsidize a Public Service, Center for Public Advocacy Research, New York, 1986. Public school teacher salaries come from the National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Education, 1985 edition.

Table 5: Costs for the Perry Preschool and the NDCS come from the sources cited for Table 3. Head Start costs are reported in Helen Blank, "Early Childhood and the Public Schools: An Essential Partnership," Young Children, May 1985. Data for various California programs come from figures made available by Jack Hailey, California Senate Office of Research; and from the California Legislative Analyst, "A Report on the Child Care Reimbursement System," July 1985. Public school spending also comes from The Condition of Education, 1985 edition.

REFERENCES

American Federation of Teachers Task Force on Educational Issues. 1986. Putting Early Childhood and Day Care Services into the Public Schools, Washington, DC, Winter.

Berreuta-Clement, John, et al. 1984. Changed Lives: The Effects of the Perry Preschool Program on Youths through Age 19. Monographs of the High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, no. 8, Ypsilanti, MI.

California Legislative Analyst. 1985. "A Report on the Child Care Reimbursement System." Sacramento, CA, July.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. 1986. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. Washington, DC, May.

Children's Defense Fund. 1985. Child Care: Whose Priority. A State Child Care Fact Book, 1985. Washington, DC.

Christian Science Monitor. Beginning March 28, 1986. Series on "Schooling: When Should It Begin?"

Coelen, Craig, et al. 1978. Day Care Centers in the U.S.: A National Profile, 1976-77. Final Report of the National Day Care Study, Vol. III. Cambridge: Abt Associates, December (available as ERIC document ED 160 188).

Consortium for Longitudinal Studies. 1983. As the Twig Is Bent: Lasting Effects of Preschool Programs. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Educational Research Service. 1986. "Kindergarten Programs and Practices in Public Schools" Arlington, VA: ERS, pp 108-109.

Education Policies Committee. 1945. Educational Services for Young Children. Washington, DC: National Education Association, December.

Fishhaut, Erna, and Donald Pastor. 1977. "Should the Schools Be Entrusted with Preschool Education: A Critique of the AFT Proposals." School Review, vol. 85, November, pp. 38-49.

Fournier, Gary, and David Rasmussen. 1986. "Salaries in Public Education: The Impact of Cost of Living Differentials." Public Finance Quarterly, vol. 14, April.

Frost, Joe. 1969. Early Childhood Reconsidered. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Gnezda, Terry, and Susan Robinson. 1986. "State Approaches to Early Childhood Education." National Conference of State Legislatures, Denver, CO: October.

Gamble, Thomas, and Edward Zigler. "The Head Start Synthesis Project: Review and Critique," unpublished.

Grubb, W. Norton. 1986. "Poor Children: Strategies in Search of Support." Austin: LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas. June.

Grubb, W. Norton, and Julia Brody. 1985. "Ketchup and Other Vegetables: The Plight of Children under Ronald Reagan." Understanding the Economic Crisis: The Impact of Poverty and Unemployment on Children and Families, J. Boulet, A.M. DeBrito, and S.A. Ray. Bush Program in Child Development and Social Policy, University of Michigan.

Grubb, W. Norton, et al. 1985. The Initial Effects of House Bill 72 on Texas Public Schools: The Challenges of Equity and Effectiveness. Austin: LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas.

Grubb, W. Norton, and Marvin Lazerson. 1982a. Broken Promises: How Americans Fail Their Children. New York: Basic Books.

Grubb, W. Norton, and Marvin Lazerson. 1982b. "The Conception of Educational Adequacy in Historical Perspective." School Finance Project, National Institute of Education, Washington, DC, June.

Grubb, W. Norton, and Marvin Lazerson. 1977. "Child Care, Government Financing, and the Public Schools: Lessons from the California Children's Center." School Review, vol. 86, November, pp. 5-37.

Hayghe, Howard. 1986. "Rise in Mothers' Labor Force Activity Includes Those with Infants." Monthly Labor Review, vol. 109, February, pp. 43-45.

Kaestle, Carl. 1983. Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society. New York: Hill and Wang.

Kimmich, Madeleine. 1985. America's Children: Who Cares? Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Lazar, Irving, and Richard Darlington. 1982. "Lasting Effects of Early Education: A Report from the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies." Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, serial no. 195, vol. 147.

Lazerson, Marvin. 1972. "The Historical Antecedents of Early Childhood Education." In Early Childhood Education, Seventy-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, edited by Ira Gordon. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Levine, James. 1978. Day Care and the Public Schools: Profiles of Five Communities. Newton, MA: Education Development Center.

McKey, R.H., et al. 1985. The Impact of Head Start on Children, Familites, and Communities. Washington, DC: CSR, Inc., June.

Morado, Carolyn. 1985. "Prekindergarten Programs for Four-Year-Olds: State Education Initiatives." National Association of Young Children, October.

Morgan, Gwen. 1985. "Programs for Young Children in the Public Schools? Only if...." Young Children, May.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. 1986a. "Position Statement on Developmentally Appropriate Practices in Programs for 4- and 5-Year Olds." Washington, DC: NAEYC, June.

National Association for the Education of Young Children. 1986b. "Developmentally Appropriate Practice in Early Childhood Programs Serving Children from Birth through Age 8." Washington, DC: NAEYC, June.

National Black Child Development Institute. 1985. Child Care in the Public Schools: Incubator for Inequality. Washington, DC: NBCDI, January.

National Governors Association. 1986. Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education. Washington, DC: August, pp. 14-15 and 95-120.

National School Public Relations Association. 1973. "Early Childhood Education: Current Trends in School Policies and Programs." Arlington, VA. NSPRA.

National Society for the Study of Education. 1929. Twenty-Eighth Yearbook: Preschool and Parental Educaiton. Bloomington, IN: Public School Publishing Co., pp. 312-313.

Schweinhart, Lawrence, and Jeffrey Koshel. 1986. Policy Options for Preschools Programs. High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Papers, no. 5, Ypsilanti, MI.

Schweinhart, Lawrence, David Weikart, and Mary Larner. 1986. "Consequences of Three Preschool Curriculum Models through Age 15." Early Childhood Research Quarterly, vol. 1, pp.15-45.

Schweinhart, Lawrence, and David Weikart. 1986. "What Do we Know So Far? A Review of the Head Start Synthesis Project." Young Children, vol. 41, June.

Schweinhart, Lawrence. 1985. Early Childhood Development Programs in the Eighties: The National Picture. High/Scope Early Childhood Policy Papers no. 1, Ypsilanti, MI.

Sirotnik, Kenneth. 1983. "What You See is What You Get--Consistency, Persistency, and Mediocrity in Classrooms." Harvard Educational Review, vol. 53, February, pp. 16-31.

Stenfels, Margaret O'Brien. 1973. Who's Minding the Children? The History and Politics of Day Care in American. New York: Simon and Schuster.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1986. "Half of Mothers with Children Under 3 Now in labor Force." USDL 86-345, Washington, DC, August.

U.S. Department of Labor. 1982. Labor Force Statistics Derived from the Current Population Survey: A Databook,, vol. 1. Washington, DC: USDOL, Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin 2096, September.

Whitebook, Marcy. 1986. "The Teacher Shortage." Young Children, March.

Whitebrook, Marcy, Carollee Howes, Rory Darrah, and Jane Friedman. 1981. "Who's Minding the Child Care Workers? A Look at Staff Burn-Out." Children Today, January-February.

Zigler, Edward, and Jeanette Valentine eds. 1979. Project Head Start: A Legacy of the War on Poverty. New York: The Free Press.

To obtain additional copies of this note contact: Communications Department, Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ 08901; (201) 828-3872.

GN834-87